FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-198
Friday
12 October 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-198 CONTENTS *12 October 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Nuclear Test Termination Appeal Presented to UN *[TASS]* 1
  UN Chief Welcomes Appeal *[TASS]* 1
Response Urged on Nuclear Test Ban Appeal *[TASS]* 1
Academic Assesses Conventional Arms Agreements *[TASS]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Interviewed on European Issues *[SOYUZ No 39]* 3
Bogachev Views NATO Chief's Call for Buildup *[TASS]* 6
Petrovskiy Submits Memorandum on UN's Role *[TASS]* 6
Shatalin Speaks at UN on Market Economy *[TASS]* 7
IZVESTIYA Reports on Greenpeace Incident *[11 Oct]* 7
ILO Offers Help With Soviet Employment Problems *[IZVESTIYA 8 Oct]* 8
Bakatin Interviewed on Interpol Membership *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 8
Possibility of Asian-Pacific Detente Assessed *[Moscow International]* 9
Concern Expressed Over Arms Race in Third World *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Oct]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Ryzhkov Meets With American Financiers *[TASS]* 12
Laptev, U.S. Official Discuss Ties, Reforms *[TASS]* 12
Obukhov, U.S. Envoy Discuss Chemical Weapons Ban *[TASS]* 12
TASS Announces U.S. Secretary Cheney's Visit 12
Pentagon Book Perpetuates 'Myth' of Soviet Threat *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Oct]* 12
U.S. Said To Want Soviet Spacecraft Reactor *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 13
Aeroflot May Buy or Lease U.S. Aircraft *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 13
Coalition in Support of Joint U.S. Trade Treaty *[TASS]* 13

China

Conference on China Opens in Moscow *[TASS]* 14
Ministerial Talks With China Show Cooperation *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 14
New Ambassador Appointed to China *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 15

Northeast Asia

Japanese Trade Groups View Soviet Market *[IZVESTIYA 28 Sep]* 15
Sale of Nuclear Reactors to DPRK Viewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 40]* 16
Prokofyev Leads Delegation to Mongolia *[TASS]* 16
Mongolia Criticizes Soviet Economic Deals *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 25 Sep]* 16
Mongolian Parliament Approves New Cabinet *[TASS]* 18

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Politburo Member Views Party Conflicts *[TASS]* 18
Transportation Venture Developed With Singapore *[PRAVDA 1 Oct]* 18

Near East & South Asia

- Reports Continue on Jerusalem Killings ... 19
    - Moscow Palestinian Group Demonstrates *[Moscow Radio]* ... 19
    - Asian-African Group Condemns Israel *[TASS]* ... 20
- Iraqi Envoy Says Soviet Citizens Offer Aid *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Oct]* ... 20
- Soviet Muslims Decline Invitation To Visit Iraq *[TASS]* ... 20
- Lebanese Official Condemns Iraqi Invasion *[TASS]* ... 20
- Commentator Urges Dialogue To Solve Gulf Crisis *[Moscow International]* ... 20
- Linkage of Gulf, Palestinian Issues Argued *[Geyvandov in IZVESTIYA 11 Oct]* ... 21
- Saudi Prince Praises Resumption of Ties *[TASS]* ... 22
- Iranian Elections of Council of Experts Viewed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* ... 22
- Comparison of Gorbachev Talks With Omani Premier ... 23
- Release of British Hostage From Lebanon Possible *[Radio Peace and Progress]* ... 23
- Indian Ocean 'Naval Arms Race' Deplored *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* ... 23
- Afghan President Receives Roving Envoy *[TASS]* ... 24

East Europe

- Polish President Interviewed on Bilateral Ties *[Warsaw PAP]* ... 24
- Polish Foreign Minister's Visit Continues ... 25
    - Interviewed on Relations *[TASS]* ... 25
    - Meets Parliamentarians *[TASS]* ... 25
    - Holds Talks With Shevardnadze *[Warsaw PAP]* ... 26
    - Ministers Focus on Joint Treaty *[Moscow International]* ... 26
    - Meets Gorbachev 12 Oct *[TASS]* ... 26
    - Gorbachev Assesses Ties *[Warsaw Radio]* ... 27
    - Mutual Concerns Reaffirmed *[Warsaw TV]* ... 27
- 'No Political Obstacles' Seen to Poland Pullout *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Oct]* ... 27
- Steep Fall in Trade With Poland Predicted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Oct]* ... 28
- Romanian Press Coverage of KGB Criticized *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 29

West Europe

- Gorbachev Advisor Views German Unification *[Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 4 Oct]* ... 30
- Calls for 'Boycott' of Troops in Germany Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Oct]* ... 33
- Joint German Nuclear Power Cooperation Planned *[TASS]* ... 33
- Gorbachev Greets Soviet Greek Festival *[IZVESTIYA 7 Oct]* ... 34
- Presidential Council Member Arrives in Cyprus *[TASS]* ... 34
- CPSU Secretary Attends Cyprus Congress *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ... 34
- Azerbaijan, Turkey Sign Cooperation Agreements *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 27 Sep]* ... 35

Latin America & Caribbean

- Army General Moiseyev Comments on Visit to Cuba *[Moscow TV]* ... 36
- Komplektov Receives Cuban Ambassador *[IZVESTIYA 10 Oct]* ... 36
- History of Relations With Cuba Discussed *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* ... 36
- Four Sailors Seek Asylum in Panama 11 Oct *[TASS]* ... 38

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

- Parties Invited To Discuss Union Treaty *[TASS]* ... 39
- Committees, Commissions Discuss Draft Laws 12 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* ... 39

Political & Social

- CPSU Issues Decision on Transition to Market *[TASS]* ... 39
- CPSU Central Committee Plenum Speeches ... 40
    - Guseletov Requests 'Specific Action' *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* ... 40

  Gidaspov Emphasizes Economics *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 41
  Medvedev Offers Academic Approach *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 42
  Akhmedov Questions Sovereignity *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 45
  Karamanov Discusses Transition *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 46
  Nenashev on 'Credit of Trust' *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 48
  Masaliyev Questions Time Frame *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 50
  Sillari Addresses Plenum *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 51
  Kolpakov Outlines Sector's Plight *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 53
TASS Analyst Says CPSU 'In Deep Trouble' *[TASS]* 55
Guseletov Says Plenum Fails To Address Crisis *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 56
Pamyat Leader Sentenced to 2 Years Imprisonment *[TASS]* 56
Oleynik, Political Parties Discuss Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 56
Gorbachev Views Reform Process *[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA 23 Sep]* 56
Adviser Defends Special Powers for Gorbachev *[Vienna DER STANDARD 11 Oct]* 57
Papers Respond To Investigation Into Article 58
  PRAVDA Denies Request for Source *[7 Oct]* 58
  TASS, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Respond *[7 Oct]* 59
  Article's Author Views Response *[PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 61
Popov Discusses Economic Perestroyka *[Rome AVANTI! 9 Oct]* 62
Police Handling of Omsk Rally Criticized *[TRUD 11 Oct]* 63
Arbat Rally Called 'Insulting,' 'Hysterical' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Oct]* 63
Railways Minister Opposes Planned Strike *[Moscow Radio]* 64
CPSU Defends October Celebration *[IZVESTIYA 6 Oct]* 64
KGB Opens Intelligence Museum *[TASS]* 65
  Deputy Comments on Opening *[Moscow TV]* 65
Kryuchkov Meets ASSOCIATED PRESS Representatives *[Moscow TV]* 65
Kalugin Lawyer Protests Ryzhkov Action *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 70
  Court To Consider Appeal *[TASS]* 70
Frolov Denies Staff's 'No-Confidence' Report *[TASS]* 70
Energy Ministry To Export Uranium for Currency *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 71
Moscow Students To Operate Radio Station *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 71
MOSCOW NEWS on Paper's 60th Anniversary *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 71
ZHURNALIST Adopts New Motto *[TASS]* 72
Suspected Priest Murderer Released *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 72
Intolerance of Media Criticism Deplored *[IZVESTIYA 9 Oct]* 72
Arbatov Discusses Soviet Foreign Policy *[Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 6 Oct]* 74
Future of Radio, Television Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 75

Economic

Dollar Worth 1.8 Rubles at New Exchange Rate *[TASS]* 76
Ryzhkov Addresses Agro-Industrial Workers Congress *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Oct]* 77
Shcherbakov Cited on Unemployment Prospects *[TASS]* 78
Commentary Supports Gorbachev Decrees on Economy *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 79
PRAVDA Readers Question Market Advocates *[5 Oct]* 79
Freightcar Shortage Delays Paper Deliveries *[Moscow TV]* 81
Sugar Refining Slowed by Inefficiency, Breakdowns *[Moscow TV]* 82
Timber Enterprise Ends Inefficient Production *[Moscow TV]* 82
Polymer Plant Improves Production on Lease System *[Moscow TV]* 82
Moscow Television Carries Computer Advertisement 83
*Increases in Kolkhoz Market Prices *[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN, No 36]* 83

Agricultural

Grain Yields Up From 1989; Purchase Rate 'Poor' *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Oct]* 85
City Dwellers Help With Bryansk Potato Harvest *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 86
Rail Transport Problems Hamper Vegetable Delivery *[Moscow TV]* 86
Agricultural Developments 27 Sep-8 Oct Reported *[Moscow Radio, etc.]* 87

Military

- Yazov Accused Over Coup-Rumor 'Exercises' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Oct]* ... 87
- Shchit Leader Disputes Yazov on Troop Movements *[Mosocw International]* ... 89
- Chief of Staff Reports Draft Evasion Figures *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* ... 90
- Sale of MiG-29's to Iran, From Germany Examined *[Moscow TV]* ... 90
- Soldiers Kill Eight in Crimea 'Shooting Spree' *[TASS]* ... 90
- Units Withdrawn From CSFR Face Housing Problem *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Oct]* ... 90
- Military Training of Foreigners Curtailed *[TASS]* ... 91
- Further on 3 Oct Armed Forces Unions Congress *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Oct]* ... 91
- Defense Official Interviewed on Arms Quality *[TRUD 28 Sep]* ... 92
- Leningrad Military District Officer Interviewed *[Zagreb DANAS 25 Sep]* ... 93
- Access to Test Range on Novaya Zemlya Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Oct]* ... 94
- Journalist Visits Novaya Zemlya Test Range *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 3 Oct]* ... 94
- Rocket Troops Political Workers Discuss Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Oct]* ... 97
- Correction to Debate on Coup Speculation ... 97

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- Rally Scores Baltic Nationalism, Defends Chikin *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* ... 98
- Coverage of Landsbergis Visit to France ... 98
  - Visit Begins 11 Oct *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 98
  - Predicts 'Full Sovereignty' *[AFP]* ... 99
  - Visit 'Recognition' of Independence *[AFP]* ... 99
- Lithuanian Supreme Council Continues Work 11 Oct *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 99
- Prunskiene Advocates Privatization 'Without Delay' *[TASS]* ... 100
- Lithuanian-USSR Working Group Meets in Moscow *[TASS]* ... 100
  - Ozolas Discusses Talks *[TASS]* ... 100
- Lithuania Acknowledges Pre-1940 Ownership Rights *[Moscow TV]* ... 101
- Lithuanian Communists Support Independence *[Vilnius International]* ... 101
- Lithuanian Information Center Opens in Oslo *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 101
- Latvian Majority Said Acting 'Imprudently' *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* ... 101
- Latvia Appoints Charge d'Affaires to Estonia *[Riga Radio]* ... 103
- Estonian Food Price Increases Expected 15 Oct *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 103
- Estonia To Contribute Anew to Union Budget *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Oct]* ... 103
- Estonian Legislature Discusses Taxes, Economy *[Moscow TV]* ... 103
- Estonia Issues Public Holidays Decree *[TASS]* ... 104
- Estonia-Leningrad Oblast Plan Economic Region *[Moscow Radio]* ... 104
- Estonian Document Details Leaseholders' Rights *[TASS]* ... 104

RSFSR

- Supreme Soviet Appoints New Government Members *[Moscow TV]* ... 104
  - Chernogorodskiy Interviewd *[Moscow Radio]* ... 107
- Yeltsin Resumes Work Following Car Accident *[TASS]* ... 108
- Silayev Discusses Delay in Economic Program *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* ... 108
- Silayev Interviewed for Republic Agreements *[Moscow TV]* ... 109
- Russian Court Rescinds Moscow Ruling on Kalugin *[TASS]* ... 110
- RSFSR Law on Relations With Soviets Adopted *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 OCT]* ... 110
- Leningrad Mayor Views Local Government Reform *[London MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* ... 111
- Voronezh Citizens Stand in Line for Food Coupons *[Moscow TV]* ... 111
- Democratic Russia Bloc Holds Regional Conference *[TASS]* ... 111
- Koryak Autonomous Soviet Republic Proclaimed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 112
- Bashkir ASSR Proclaims State Sovereignty *[TASS]* ... 112
- Komi-Permyak Okrug Becomes Autonomous Oblast *[Moscow Radio]* ... 112
- KOMSOMOLETS Registered as Youth Paper *[Moscow Radio]* ... 112

Western Republics

Dacha Plots Allotted for Belorussian Elite *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 112
Belorussian Party's Method of Change Protested *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 16 Sep]* 113
Ukraine-RSFSR Hold 'Consultations' *[IZVESTIYA 8 Oct]* 114
Students, Deputies Strike Demands Resignations *[TASS]* 114
WWII Veterans' Letter Assails Anticommunist Acts *[RABOCHAYA GAZETA 19 Sep]* 115
Kharkov Obkom Political Clashes With RuKh Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 26 Sep]* 116

Caucasus

KGB Raids Plane Carrying Arms to Caucasus *[Moscow TV]* 117
New Minister, Officials Appointed in Armenia *[Yerevan International]* 117
Stepanakert Organizations Reportedly on Strike *[Yerevan International]* 117
Armenian Collegium Meets Over Armed Attack *[Yerevan Radio]* 117
Armenian Anticrime Body Becomes Operational *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Armenia, Azerbaijan Ministries Exchange Notes *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 118
Azerbaijan Communists Lead in Unofficial Poll *[TASS]* 118
    240 Results Announced *[TASS]* 119
Radioactivity Level in Sheki Rayon Studied *[Baku Radio]* 119
Calls for Georgian Government To Quit 'Widespread' *[Moscow International]* 119

Central Asia

Current Political Situation in Kirghizia Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Oct]* 120
Agreement Signed Between Tajikistan, Turkmenistan *[Moscow Radio]* 120
Turkmenia Opts for Presidential Form of Rule *[Moscow Radio]* 120
Unemployment Problem in Uzbekistan Examined *[PRAVDA 8 Oct]* 121

Nuclear Test Termination Appeal Presented to UN

LD1110082590 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] New York October 11 TASS—United Nations Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar on Wednesday received a Soviet parliamentary delegation on a week-long visit to the United States.

They handed him an appeal from the Supreme Soviet to the parliaments and public of the world for a complete end to nuclear weapons testing.

Perez de Cuellar, saying he was deeply satisfied with the statement, stressed the important role it could play in efforts to stop testing altogether and reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles.

He said the United Nations would take urgent steps to support the appeal.

Perez de Cuellar also expressed gratitude to the Soviet Government for its policy towards the United Nations, which, he said, had helped inject new strength into the organisation. He added that Soviet perestroyka had provided the principal stimulus to enhance the U.N.'s role.

Soviet delegation members later gave a news conference at the U.N. Headquarters on perestroyka.

Speakers included delegation leader Genrikh Borovik, a member of the Parliamentary Committee on International Relations, Sergey Lavrov, a member of the Council of Nationalities Commission on Nationalities Policies and Ethnic Relations, and Valentin Minayev, secretary of the Supreme Soviet Committee on Economic Reform.

In addition, the delegation met the leaders of the Ukrainian and Belorussian delegations taking part in the 45th U.N. General Assembly session and attended meetings of the Security Council and the Economic and Financial Committee.

They had talks with U.N. secretariat experts on the Soviet Union's use of world experience to establish free economic zones and a market system.

"We do not want the Supreme Soviet appeal to be seen here as propaganda," Borovik told TASS. "It is an expression of Soviet legislator's will, and if their colleagues in the United Nations support the cessation of nuclear testing, many politicians that are still undecided will find it easier to make up their minds in favour of halting all nuclear tests."

If the United States accept our challenge, it will be possible to put an end to nuclear testing very quickly. If the Americans stop testing in Nevada, the British and the French will soon follow suit.

"Francois Mitterrand said recently that France would not like to be the last country to stop testing. China would hardly stay aloof either."

The Soviet delegation are now going to Washington to hand the parliamentary appeal to members of the U.S. Congress.

UN Chief Welcomes Appeal

LD1210043190 Moscow TASS in English 2114 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] United Nations Organisation October 11 TASS—U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar cordially welcomes the appeal of the Soviet parliament to parliaments throughout the world about the termination of nuclear weapons tests, official spokesman for the U.N. secretary-general Francois Giuliani said at a briefing today.

Perez de Cuellar described the appeal as a timely initiative. During a meeting with a Soviet parliamentary delegation on Wednesday he reiterated the U.N. stand on the banning of nuclear weapons tests, the spokesman said.

Response Urged on Nuclear Test Ban Appeal

LD1010145290 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 10 Oct 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow October 10 TASS—The Soviet parliament ratified the two so-called "threshold" treaties in a 347-0 vote, with three abstentions. As expected, the ratification of the 1974 threshold test ban treaty and the 1976 peaceful nuclear explosions treaty has passed unimpeded.

Nevertheless, consideration of the above treaties provided a pretext for a detailed analysis of important issues: how the nuclear disarmament process is progressing and what hampers it.

In particular, attention was paid to the fact that the U.S. Senate hedged the ratification of the "threshold" treaties with conditions which are in actual fact nothing more than an attempt to enable the United States to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons. Fears were also expressed that that new weapon was designed to have space applications.

Undoubtedly, all this caused serious concern in the Soviet parliament.

Of no less importance is another question: Where can progress be made? The "threshold" treaties, although unratified for many years, have been actually observed by the Soviet Union and the United States.

With the two countries' ratification, there is a chance for further advances at the nuclear explosions talks. It is well known that it had been agreed early in the talks that at the subsequent stages the sides must go over to coordinating further intermediate limitations on nuclear tests, in terms of yields and their annual number, on the road to the ultimate goal of a complete ban on nuclear tests.

The Soviet parliament on Tuesday endorsed an address to parliaments around the world asking them to promote the complete termination of nuclear tests.

Are other nuclear powers ready to support this initiative? I think that this question primarily concerns the United States. Admittedly, even American lawmakers are unable to answer this question. Some of them are clearly interested in moving forward. In mid-1989 a letter was sent to the White House signed by nearly 25 per cent of all senators and a third of congressmen. They urged the President to pursue a policy aimed at concluding with the Soviet Union an agreement on new limitations of underground nuclear tests.

This September the House of Representatives voted 234-182 for an amendment to the Defence Appropriations Bill which says that the United States should tell the Soviet Union about its intention to resume bilateral talks on the verifiable, complete ban on nuclear tests.

However, the American delegation is taking no relevant measures in this direction. An official report by the U.S. Energy Department, drafted this April, gives an idea of what the executive plans to do. It proposes that the question on whether the United States can impose additional limitations on nuclear tests without detriment to national security should be postponed another ten years.

Should the world community wait for the beginning of the next millennium to deliver the world from nuclear holocaust?

One would like to hope that the Soviet parliament's address will find a response in official Washington and capitals of other nuclear powers.

Academic Assesses Conventional Arms Agreements

LD1110223690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1256 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Oct (TASS)—The talks between Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker in New York have demonstrated that the USSR and the United States are moving away from the traditional principles which demanded a scrupulous count of individual weapons units—and this is precisely the secret of their success. This is the view of Sergey Blagovolin, head of the department of military-economic and military-political research at the Institute of World Economics and International Relations. Today, at the request of a TASS correspondent, he expressed his views on the prospects for the signing of an agreement on conventional armaments, in light of the recent meeting in New York between the foreign ministers of the USSR and the United States.

After describing their agreement on the basic parameters of a future treaty as "a decisive step" toward the signing of the "Vienna-1" agreement, the Soviet expert singled out two points on which a mutually acceptable solution has been found as a result of the New York meeting: the question of the USSR's share of the total balance of armaments in Europe and the problem of restrictions on aircraft. According to Blagovolin, "A sensible compromise has been reached on both questions." Nevertheless, he added, "The important thing here is not the military and technical details. Baker and Shevardnadze made a political decision, not a military or technical decision."

According to Blagovolin, the "breakthrough" toward the signing of an agreement on conventional armaments (which is expected to take place next month in Paris) was also important because "the momentum which has picked up must not be lost now." In this connection he expressed disagreement with the views of a number of experts who oppose the signing of a treaty on the grounds that, allegedly, it "has been prepared for a different Europe—the old Europe." "Europe," Sergey Blagovolin said, "has indeed changed fundamentally. In fact, now that a united Germany has been created, the number of participants at the Vienna talks has actually decreased. However, the agreement should be signed at this very time, because it will make it possible to radically change the psychological climate of military relations between East and West." "Therefore," the expert stressed, "any reference to the change in the number of participants in the talks and the emergence of so-called new technical circumstances would cast us a long way back." Furthermore, Sergey Blagovolin added, even now "we should be thinking about the shape of talks to which many have given the codename 'Vienna-2.'"

Shevardnadze Interviewed on European Issues

91UF0007A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No. 39, Sep 90 pp 4-5

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze by Yevgeniy Sorokin; place and date not given: "It Is Shameful To Recognize Oneself as Being Happy When There Are So Many Problems and Unhappy People All Around"]

[Text] [Sorokin] We are used to speaking about the relationship between domestic and foreign policy. How is this relationship reflected currently? And what is the explanation for the fact that in foreign policy we have many conquests, but in internal affairs, a tense situation?

[Shevardnadze] I am convinced that today, now, it would be far more difficult for us were it not for the capital which the country's foreign policy has built up in the years of perestroyka. I could be speaking—and am—both of direct investments in perestroyka and of moral and political support for it.

The capital of trust has come about as a result of our renunciation of inordinately ideologized approaches to the management of foreign policy matters and the "enemy" and "adversary" phantoms which induced a world divided by seemingly irreconcilable confrontation to seek salvation in an arms race and exclusively military means of ensuring security.

Having removed the basis of the confrontation, we embodied the principles of the new political thinking in actual steps and switched in practice from confrontation to dialogue, from rivalry to interaction, and from interaction to cooperation.

I do not care for retrospective forecasts, but it is not hard to imagine what would have happened to us had the former atmosphere of bipolar irreconcilability continued. We would hardly have survived the dual strain, dual pressure—from within and from outside. Foreign policy has removed the factors of external pressure, and, thanks to this, things are now far easier for us than they might have been.

I would answer the second part of your question as follows: No matter how complex the change in priorities in foreign policy in itself, this is, for all that, easier than reorganizing a giant internal system in all its political, management and economic, state-administrative, social, and other components. It has taken shape over decades, forming such intricate ties and couplings that it is impossible to break them up and replace them with new ones at a stroke without the risk of dangerous currents and upheavals.

The factors of power and strict centralization reduced to nothing the outward signs of centrifugal trends, which could not have failed to have existed in such a vast and diverse "world of worlds" as our Union. When perestroyka removed them, essentially political factors of dialogue and a joint civilized search for concord and a balance of interests had to have moved to the forefront. To our common misfortune, time had not taught us tolerance and had not contributed to the molding of the political and legal culture without which the building of democratic institutions and a state based on the rule of law are accompanied by excesses of permissiveness and distorted by spontaneous outbursts of destructive forces. Too often we raise our voices without concerning ourselves with an endeavor to hear another and be heard by him.

[Sorokin] How has the introduction of the office of USSR president and the election of M.S. Gorbachev to this office affected the work of the Foreign Ministry and the solution of foreign policy problems?

[Shevardnadze] I was an emphatic supporter of the idea of the establishment of presidential authority in the country and from the very outset advocated the election of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as president of the USSR. Many other reasons apart, for the added reason that in the country and in the world our new foreign policy and the restructuring of interstate and international relations on the principles of the new political thinking are rightly identified with his activity. The functions and duties of the president presuppose the adoption of most important decisions in the foreign policy sphere. The Foreign Ministry, like other departments also constituting the country's foreign policy complex, operates on the basis of the decisions, instructions, and directives of the president, being responsible to him, the highest organs of democracy, and the government of the Union.

[Sorokin] What are your personal relations with the president like? With parliament and the government? Are you satisfied with your work?

[Shevardnadze] I have already had occasion to say that I perceived the honor awarded me as a choice of comradeship and like-mindedness. It is not possible to work in any way normally in such an office as mine without sharing the ideas, views, principles, and aims of the personality who chose you. Otherwise it would be better to leave. I, after all, made my choice too. And it would most likely be not enough to say that our relations are businesslike, respectful, and comradely. It is rather a connection of people of a common destiny and responsibility, which does not, of course, rule out the element of debate in approaches to a discussion of foreign policy problems.

I have already partially answered the question concerning relations with parliament and the government. I would merely add that I consider a useful and efficient rule the accountability of the state authorities to the organs of democracy and that the Foreign Ministry realizes this rule in practice in every possible way, even structurally.

As to satisfaction with my work, I have highly complex relations with this condition. Every day it passes me by for there always remains much of all kinds of "unfinished business," and this is depressing. Satisfaction only comes when there is a big result. When, for example, we signed the Geneva Afghanistan accords and withdrew our forces from this country. Or when we concluded the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Shorter- and Intermediate-Range Missiles.

But inasmuch as there are more desired big results than there are those that have been achieved, I still have a long way to go before I feel complete satisfaction with my work.

[Sorokin] You worked for a long time in Georgia in various positions unrelated to foreign affairs. How did your "reorientation" occur? Is your previous experience a help to you under the new conditions?

[Shevardnadze] It would be far more difficult for me to perform my present duties without this experience. We touch once again here on the relationship of the domestic and the foreign. A lack of knowledge about a country's internal situation and its development priorities and clear ideas about what is impeding it and what could promote it is disastrous for a diplomat. I believe that my former work gave me such knowledge and ideas. In addition, the view of a first secretary of a republic Communist Party Central Committee and Politburo candidate member could not have been confined to the republic. And work in these offices had, if not a direct, a quite pronounced outlet into the foreign policy sphere.

Nonetheless, I would not venture to maintain that the "reorientation," as you put it, was for me easy and straightforward—"I came, I saw, I conquered." Yes, I came, but to a milieu of the kind of high professionals who, I understand, could not without certain doubts, to put it mildly, have accepted in their circle an "outside" nonprofessional. The foreign minister is not, after all, simply the leader of a department, he is in addition the lead specialist in the "shop" and the exponent of much and highly specific knowledge, virtues, and ability. Only as such may he be acknowledged and accepted by his colleagues.

I was well aware of all this, which did not make it any easier for me. Even somewhat more difficult, perhaps. Fortunately for me, my colleagues, not displaying their misgivings, manifested a desire to help, support, and facilitate the entry into the intricate world of diplomacy. The benevolent attitude of foreign colleagues meant much to me also, which I attribute to perestroyka, the country's new foreign policy course, and the "Gorbachev line."

[Sorokin] What is your attitude toward the changes in the East European countries? What is the socialist camp today?

[Shevardnadze] Indeed, what is the "socialist camp"? A group of countries linked by unity of sociopolitical goals and ideals by which their leaders unswervingly abide in practice and which are supported by the people's masses at large? Or an alliance of ruling elites in which the priorities of party and state relations coinciding with clan interests are predominant?

If the members of a family do not recognize and do not desire kinship with one another, this is not a family. However strong the power of the head of the family, whatever the attributes of commanding authority with which it is armed, it is short-lived. There had been more than sufficient indications of this—the end of the 1940's, 1953, 1956, 1968, the 1970's.... The model of socialism which had been established in our country and which was subsequently transferred to the East European countries was not accepted by the peoples of these countries. And, after all, we also recognized it to be flawed and in many hypostases very far removed from socialism, and we are now attempting to organize another, more humane model, one, consequently, more in keeping with the socialist ideal. So can we fail to recognize as legitimate the course of events in East Europe? Their driving force were the people's masses, and the choice which they made should be respected.

Good-neighborly, friendly, mutually profitable relations with democratic states based on respect for freedom of the choice made by their peoples, national sovereignty, and the principle of noninterference in internal affairs are in our country's interests. Aside from the imposed and rejected "kinship," there are natural, historically evolved ties of geopolitical, economic, spiritual, and cultural proximity, which predetermine our mutual attraction. Strengthening these ties is a priority task of our foreign policy.

[Sorokin] How in the light of this task do you view the "common European home" project? Is its realization at all possible under current conditions?

[Shevardnadze] The practical possibility category should be directly linked here with the vital need for all Europeans to implement this project. Two-bloc Europe is becoming a thing of the past. Its area, even recently cleaved by an "iron curtain," is being cleared of the ruins of the "cold war" for the foundations of common all-European structures. The creation of a single legal, economic, and cultural space is being spoken of as a reality. In the light of the close unification of Germany the task of the formation of all-European security structures would seem pertinent and, I would say, urgent.

There are already the corresponding draft outlines on this score. The transformation of the two military alliances in the direction of their politicization and cooperation between them no longer seem abstract dreaming following the statement of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries adopted at the Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee and the "London Declaration" of the NATO heads of state.

On this year's political calendar is the top-level November meeting of the 35 participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which, we hope, will mark a decisive frontier in the creation of new European realities.

It has been observed that architects more readily utter the word "will" than the word "is." This is true to an even greater extent in respect of politicians: There is a tremendous distance between the elaboration of a project and its material embodiment. And, of course, realization of the idea of a united Europe will require a colossal input of the efforts, intellect, and will of all Europeans. But the European situation and the imperatives confronting the continent are currently such that we simply cannot fail to practically embody a design possessing the best minds of Europe.

[Sorokin] Concerning, incidentally, the "architects of policy," you are acquainted with many of the world's prominent politicians. Which of them would you care to distinguish? What is your personal idea of the qualities necessary for a politician of international stature?

[Shevardnadze] If you will permit me, I will take not only international stature. At a moment when time and events are intensifying the political process, involving in it new and, until now, inconceivable figures and values, our concept of the range of values is becoming arbitrary. Yesterday's social odd man out, once ranked as a dissident, is the head of a group, party, movement, or even country. A recent figure of regional stature is perpetrating actions engendering the danger of a world conflict. An obscure "informal" is advancing slogans which are being taken up by a multitude of people....

I am not about to instruct anyone but, in my opinion, for a figure of any scale desiring to be a politician in the true meaning of this word the problem of the correlation of end and means should be paramount. Machiavellianism of any level confessing the principle of "the end justifies the means" is denied by history itself. Pseudoromantic and speciously patriotic appeals to freedom and independence at any price and a declared readiness to condemn a people to suffering and deprivation in the name of wrongly interpreted ends are not to my liking. Furthermore, I am convinced that attempts to accomplish some tasks, even if important, from the standpoint of this politician or the other in isolation from the general context, be it world, regional, or provincial, are futile. Responsibility to one's own people and country should not be a bedfellow with irresponsibility to others—it is ultimately avenged in telling blows against one's near ones and dear ones....

Many of those whom I know in the world of big politics are characterized precisely by this unity of responsibility to their own country and the world, and the rare exceptions merely emphasize the anachronism of different behavior.

[Sorokin] Dealing with foreign figures, do you not at times sense an involuntary detachment from the country's urgent concerns?

[Shevardnadze] None! All with which we are concerned, all in whose name we are working is here, at home. Home, country, motherland are with us everywhere. All their concerns and troubles—the crisis economy, interethnic discord, the ordeals to which our young democracy is being subjected.... All ailments and problems—from suffering nature through transition to the market economy—are involved in the diplomatic turnover.

[Sorokin] A little about yourself, please: family, friends, amusements. Do you consider yourself a happy individual? What would you like to wish young people?

[Shevardnadze] My family consists of my wife, son, daughter, and grandchildren. I could say a great deal about those close to me, but it is difficult for me to do so for a whole number of reasons: There are things that somehow are embarrassing to talk about publicly. But, briefly: We in the family all understand one another very well.

When people ask about friends, I think with regret and sadness about the fact that I have in recent years been entirely deprived of the joy of socializing with them. But the feeling of friendship is in itself the joy and good fortune of realizing that there are somewhere people on whom one may count. And in my work surroundings also, incidentally, I see people I could call friends, although we never say this out loud.

Amusements? One very important statesman, a leader of a major European country, once asked me whether I liked soccer and whether I "rooted" for anyone. I said that I had done so long ago. "And now?" "Now I do not have the time," I said.

I could say this about many of my other predilections also: There is not enough time, unfortunately, for anything other than work. That "other," incidentally, is constantly intruding on the life of a diplomat—interest in engineering innovations in the sphere of farming, say, preserving the cultural heritage, literature, art, journalism—such is our profession.

Happiness is a variable category. Our forebears rightly caught and accurately clothed in the form of a commandment the following moral constant: It is shameful to recognize oneself to be happy when there are so many misfortunes and unhappy people all around. Shameful and simply impossible. Even living in harmony with one's work, beliefs, near ones, and friends, not yielding an inch of ground to one's foes—not of myself but of the cause—and experiencing the "thrill of battle" and work, I do not perceive myself to be an entirely happy individual. Only sometimes, having "broken through" something or other, having gotten something moving, having mastered something or other, and having seen a glimmer of light, do I perceive a portent of happiness.

Each generation learns to live by its own primers created by the method of trial and error. Only with age does one begin to understand how much one was given by the once-rejected experience of one's predecessors. All this has yet to be recognized by those who will come after us. Without considering that I have the right to instruct them, I would like to wish that they may avoid the disasters and losses of my generation and develop our modest discoveries many times over. That they might perceive in full measure the happiness of living in a country of happy people.

Bogachev Views NATO Chief's Call for Buildup

LD1110193890 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, U.S. General John Galvin, announced on Tuesday that West European countries are unable, under present conditions, to ensure their security on their own. He demanded that the U.S. retain its mighty military presence in Turkey and the Mediterranean.

Galvin told a news conference in Istanbul that plans to build up NATO forces on the southern flank were prompted by the lessons of the Gulf crisis in a region where new complications might arise in the future.

At the end of September, Galvin proposed stationing special rapid deployment forces 5,000 kilometers away from the Middle East and the Mediterranean, leaving no doubts as to who he aimed to war against there.

The beefing up of NATO's northern and southern flanks by building up the U.S. military presence there and the proposed expansion of the western military alliance's "zone of responsibility" beyond the boundaries of its 16 member-countries calls into question the actual objectives of the new U.S. military strategy. It aims at shifting the emphasis from a global war against the Soviet Union to so-called regional variants.

Tempestuous political changes, unprecedented in their scale, are now taking place in the world. Earlier views on methods to ensure the security of individual countries and the tasks and functions of military alliances are also undergoing changes.

The Warsaw Pact is being radically transformed and assuming the character of a political, consultative organisation. The Soviet Union is withdrawing troops from Eastern Europe and considerably cutting troops and arms, including nuclear.

New trends are becoming pronounced in the West as well. Many politicians are increasingly aware that stability in Europe can be ensured only by political means.

"The era of confrontation is over," NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner said "and we are now trying to lay the foundation for cooperation with the Soviet Union." The heads of states and governments of the NATO member countries declared at the NATO session that the North Atlantic alliance should extend a hand of friendship to East European nations. And those were not mere words.

The United States, for instance, has renounced the modernisation of short range missiles in Western Europe and announced that it would withdraw nuclear artillery ammunition from the European continent. NATO recognised the need to correct its flexible response strategy and cancelled the resolution about the three per cent annual increase of military budgets.

These moves by the West can only be welcomed. But the adaptation by the United States and other NATO member-countries to new realities must proceed at a higher rate.

Apprehension is caused by Washington's statements about continuing commitments to the Star War plans. Plans are being hatched in the United States to deploy new air-to-surface nuclear missiles in Europe.

U.S. plans to build up NATO flank forces in close proximity to Soviet borders also appear to be relics of the past cold war.

Petrovskiy Submits Memorandum on UN's Role

LD1110204690 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] New York October 11 TASS—The Soviet Union today submitted to the United Nations a memorandum entitled "The United Nations Organisation in the Post-Confrontational World." The document sums up the Soviet Union's views on the United Nations' changed role. The Soviet Union believes that the United Nations is the main mechanism in the construction of a new world order.

"This is a unique moment," said Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, deputy head of the Soviet delegation to the 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly, presenting the memorandum at the United Nations headquarters today. "The replacement of rivalry with partnership and the assertion of the supremacy of law opened unprecedented prospects to the United Nations," he told the news conference.

Emphasising that the system of international peace, security and cooperation resting on the United Nations Charter should be used to the utmost, Petrovskiy stressed several key points. He said that the Soviet Union attaches special importance to enhancing the Security Council's role. He said that the most recent Security Council meeting, in which foreign ministers of a number of countries had participated, had been successful. This experience should be consolidated. "We believe that the Security Council should have a greater sense of responsibility," he said.

Petrovskiy suggested that a meeting of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations Security Council should be held at the level of chiefs of the general staffs of the five permanent members of the Security Council. The meeting should discuss the Gulf situation.

Petrovskiy said that the General Assembly should attend to practical tasks and should enhance the role of the United Nations secretary-general, who is a prominent politician. He said that an integrated strategy for global partnership in the nineties and at the beginning of the new century should now be worked out.

Shatalin Speaks at UN on Market Economy

LD1110105490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0238 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Excerpts] United Nations, 11 Oct (TASS)—Academician Stanislav Shatalin, member of the USSR Presidential Council, spoke Wednesday [10 October] at the UN's New York headquarters at a special meeting of the UN Second Committee (economic and financial issues) on the topic of "the transition to a market economy in the Soviet Union." He elucidated basic aspects of the reform currently in preparation. The country has gone the whole way to recognize the impossibility of developing further within the framework of the administrative command system, Shatalin stressed. [passage omitted]

The member of the Presidential Council spoke in favor of a review of relations between the USSR and "Third World" countries, noting that these relations should be based on a normal economic footing. Here he stressed that aid to less developed countries should be effected through the channels of international organizations. In his words, the denial of such aid would be amoral.

Responding to questions regarding the possibility of the ruble's convertibility, Shatalin said that before achieving foreign convertibility, one has to ensure domestic convertibility. In his appraisal it will be possible to approach foreign convertibility in three to four years time—500 days are clearly insufficient for this.

IZVESTIYA Reports on Greenpeace Incident

PM1110134190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by F. Ivanov under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "26th CPSU Congress Arrests Greenpeace"]

[Text] On 8 October the Soviet coast guard ship 26th CPSU Congress arrested the ship Greenpeace—belonging to the organization of that name—in USSR territorial waters.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent was informed by the USSR KGB Border Guards Directorate that the Greenpeace was in the Soviet ports of Murmansk, Arkhangelsk, and Naryan-Mar between 22 September and 7 October. There were 34 people on board, seven of them Soviet citizens, including USSR People's Deputy Zolotkov. On 7 October, after leaving Naryan-Mar bound for Murmansk, Greenpeace deviated from its route and headed for the Novaya Zemlya islands. While sailing by Novaya Zemlya the ship entered USSR territorial waters.

The commander of coast guard ship 26th CPSU Congress repeatedly warned the ship about its illegal actions and violations of the USSR state border and in the end demanded that it leave Soviet territorial waters. The captain of the Greenpeace responded by saying that he did not recognize Soviet borders, and since there were Soviet representatives on the ship he could go where he liked.

All this entitled the coast guard commander to stop and arrest the ship. But it was not possible at the time, because a storm had blown up off the Novaya Zemlya coast. Around 0200 on 8 October, the ship broke off communications with the coast guard ship and made for the shore of one of the Novaya Zemlya islands. In doing so, it performed a dangerous maneuver, creating an emergency for the coast guard ship. At 0300 the ship lowered launches, which made for the shore. The Greenpeace captain did not respond to the coast guard ship's demands to stop what he was doing.

At 0415, the coast guard issued a warning by firing its machine gun, whereupon the Greenpeace came to a stop. In accordance with legislation, the coast guard commander put a five-man inspection party on the ship. The crew of the Greenpeace tried to prevent the group from boarding, so the border guards had to use grappling hooks to bring it alongside. Nevertheless, members of the crew detained the border guards group at the back of the vessel and would not let them enter the cabin area. Because of this, the coast guard commander decided to put two more similar groups of border guards aboard the Greenpeace. The captain of the ship and the crew continued to hinder the inspection, refused to present ship's documents, and soon shut themselves in their cabins and refused to have anything to do with the border guards.

In the end, with the help of USSR People's Deputy Zolotkov, it was possible to establish contact with the Greenpeace captain. The inspection group commander told him that he was arresting the ship in connection with the deliberate violation of the border, the refusal to submit to the border guards, and the landing of people in unspecified places. He also demanded a reply to the question: Is everyone on board? It turned out that four people had already landed on Novaya Zemlya. But, despite the fact that the "volunteers'" lives were in danger in that totally uninhabited area, the ship's captain refused to say where they had landed and said that they were equipped for long-term survival in those conditions. According to the border guards, he displayed a fine knowledge of Russian—at least the dirty words.

The coast guard ship commander dispatched a search group to Novaya Zemlya, which found four people together with four rucksacks filled with dirt. The detainees were taken to the coast guard ship. The Greenpeace was then taken in tow by the coast guard ship Yenisey, because the Greenpeace captain refused to sail under his own steam.

At midday on 10 October, the ship reached the passage into Kola Bay, where it is expected at 2300 on 11 October. There were no casualties on board. When it arrives in Kola Bay the USSR Prosecutor's Office will start investigating the reasons for and circumstances of the ship's violation of Soviet laws. According to the border guards' information, there were no official requests to visit Novaya Zemlya either from the ship's captain or from the Greenpeace organization.

ILO Offers Help With Soviet Employment Problems

PM1210094990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by S. Chugayev: "The Market, Unemployment, and the International Labor Organization"]

[Text] For 70 years, the International Labor Organization has been defending the interests of working people throughout the world. An accord was reached for the first time the other day on its cooperation with the USSR.

Quite a significant event took place a few days before discussion of a draft Law on Employment began in the country's Supreme Soviet: For the first time, the general director of the International Labor Organization, whose main purpose is to combat unemployment and poverty, appeared at the same table as a Soviet colleague—the chairman for the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems. This event occurred on the concluding day of the work of an international conference entitled: "Flexibility of the Labor Market and Employment Reform in the USSR."

During the course of the four days of discussions, the foreign experts showed that their knowledge about our labor, economic, and social difficulties is scarcely inferior to the knowledge of our native specialists. Some of the main problems which we must solve without fail if we want to create a really effective labor market were identified. Above all, we should create a new, efficient revenue system, which would become the main element in the social protection of the individual. A system of employment and retraining centers and job placement bureaus are needed. And also statistical and sociological research agencies to reflect the real state of affairs. Our current statistical and sociological agencies, in the opinion of the foreign experts, are not coping with this task.

The recommendations elaborated at the conference are undoubtedly useful. But I would call the main achievement not these recommendations but the fact that our system of labor and social questions came into contact with an organization which we first branded "an agent of capital," and later mildly reproved for "reformism." And all because the International Labor Organization's main principle is a trilateral dialogue—between the government, the working people, and the employers—in the solution of all social problems. We, as is well known, did not consider the employer to be a human being—only an exploiter.

Addressing the participants in the congress, Michel Hansenne, director general of the ILO—the International Labor Organization—stressed that a switch to a new form of economics presupposes the adoption of thousands of decisions. And it is only we ourselves who can adopt them. As for the International Labor Organization, it is willing to pass on the huge experience of curbing unemployment which the organization has accumulated over seven decades.

This help will not just be theoretical. V. Tokman [name as transliterated], the director of the ILO Department of Employment and Economic Development, told me that the first International Labor Organization mission in our country will be opened in Moscow in the very near future. Initially it will consist of three people: a specialist in the organization of labor services; a specialist in the organization of professional and technical training; and an expert in retraining center equipment. The initial plan is to open these centers in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Belorussia, and Uzbekistan. It has already been decided that the International Labor Organization may help to equip them with computers. It is also planned for several thousand Soviet specialist employees of the job placement bureaus to undergo a probationary period through the channels of the International Labor Organization in developed capitalist countries.

What will our own, Soviet, labor market be like? In V. Tokman's opinion, it is impossible to answer this question. No two models in the world are alike. Specific national conditions determine measures for the protection of working people. Our labor market will not resemble a single one of the already existing markets; after all, it is the first time in history that a state is moving from a centralized society to a market society.

Bakatin Interviewed on Interpol Membership

PM1010124590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Second Edition p 7

[Interview with USSR Internal Affairs Minister V.V. Bakatin by correspondent V. Shelkov: "We Have Joined Interpol"]

[Text] Ottawa—The 59th session of the International Criminal Police Organization [Interpol] General Assembly was held in Ottawa at the end of September and beginning of October. At the session, as has been reported, the Soviet Union was accepted as a member of Interpol. USSR Internal Affairs Minister V.V. Bakatin was visiting Canada at the time, continuing to develop contacts between Soviet and Canadian law-enforcement organs. PRAVDA's own correspondent in Canada asked the minister to answer a number of questions on the meetings and talks.

[Shelkov] Vadim Viktorovich, why—although, so they say, it is long overdue—did we join Interpol at this particular moment? What will we get from membership of the organization and what will we contribute ourselves?

[Bakatin] As you know, views on Interpol membership have varied. Some, for example, have said that we are already too late in joining. Others put it this way: "Why do we need to anyway? And, what is more, why pay membership dues of approximately $500,000 per year?" I believe that neither were we too late, nor was it a hasty step.

The policy that the Soviet leadership is conducting made it inevitable that the USSR should join Interpol at this time: We have opened ourselves up to the whole world and are prepared to participate in all world processes.

Crime knows no frontiers. And it would be foolish in these new political conditions to live outside the long established, elaborate international police structure.

There is another aspect to the question of the need to join Interpol. The organization represents a pool of international police experience of the fight against crime. It has its own systems for analysis and for issuing recommendations, for example, on the fight against narcotics or terrorism, organized crime or the laundering of money.... Interpol is a mine of information which it would be a sin for real professionals not to use.

[Shelkov] Would an Interpol employee now be able to go to the USSR to join the militia in conducting an investigation?

[Bakatin] Joint investigation is possible in principle. But it would be more effective if we were to engage in some task on behalf of Interpol. Would it actually be convenient for a Canadian policemen, for example, to work here with an interpreter?

[Shelkov] Some months ago Royal Canadian Mounted Police Commissioner Norman Inkster visited the USSR. You are paying a reciprocal visit to that country. What are the prospects of contacts between the USSR and Canadian law-enforcement organs as a new area of Soviet-Canadian relations?

[Bakatin] Incidentally, I have invited the Canadian police commissioner to visit the USSR again.

It is very important to mention that our cooperation has already yielded practical results. Suffice it to mention the 1987 joint operation to uncover a drug ring in Montreal, whose "wares" were crossing Soviet territory and were discovered by our customs officers. Nor should one forget that our trade, economic, and other links are going to expand. Exchanges of people are increasing. Therefore, we need to establish contacts to ensure that criminals are unable to pass freely from one country to another.

[Shelkov] Toronto is the home of North America's first independent commission for complaints against the police. Could this catch on in our country?

[Bakatin] I see what you are saying. It is a very fine development. Incidentally, we have a similar thing at home. In Georgia. A public committee has been set up there, headed by well-known, respected people. The organization monitors the militia's work, goes to investigate complaints, checks facts, and submits reports to the minister. I believe what is happening in Toronto could be valuable for us too.

[Shelkov] Your visit to Canada concluded with the initialing of a memorandum on relations between the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. What kind of document is it?

[Bakatin] The Internal Affairs Ministry has three types of links with the "outside world." First, through the UN structure. Second, a new one—through Interpol. Third—bilateral relations. The third type used to predominate, mainly with our neighbors, the East European countries.

Now we need to expand the system of bilateral contacts, including those with the developed capitalist countries. The Canadians have perhaps gone somewhat further than our other Western partners in this area. With most of them we have arranged program documents which merely contain a number of concrete measures. But the Canadians proposed concluding fundamental agreements on the procedure and rules of mutual relations, without going into specifics. This is a good example, and we will certainly use it in our dealings with other partners.

Possibility of Asian-Pacific Detente Assessed

OW0910222790 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0700 GMT 5 Oct 90

["Short article" by station correspondent Belov: "The Era of Detente in the Pacific"; from the "Asian Events and Situation" program]

[Text] Europe has been universally recognized as the center of detente in the world. The foundation for an unusually extensive process, the Helsinki process, of peace was established there. Military detente began on the Continent of Europe through the formulation and implementation of mutual trust in international affairs. The principle of the immutability of the post-war borders was solemnly declared there. On 3 October, the international community witnessed the unification of Germany, which was split because of World War II. Against this background, it would appear that the Asian-Pacific region has been cloaked by the cold front of the cold war for a long time, suppressing every seedling of a healthy process by military confrontation. However, the time has come for a political detente to dawn in the Asian-Pacific region. It also bears out the proposition that "no man is an island" in the world today.

The complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations was a major event last year. The relations between the two countries had been very tense for more than 20 years in the past. There also has been a marked improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. This process of improvement and perfection, which appeared first in Europe, also is expanding gradually to the Asian continent. During their meeting in Irkutsk in early August, the foreign affairs chiefs of the two superpowers said that the Soviet Union and the United States would no longer treat each other as enemies in Europe and in Asia as well. A dialogue between Moscow and Tokyo is also being established. Soviet President Gorbachev plans to visit Japan next spring. Of course, you realize that a visit by a head of state is related directly to the level of mutual ties. This is the so-called general line for improving the situation in the Asian-Pacific region.

It seems to me that a new atmosphere has emerged in the political sphere of the Asian-Pacific region over the past few weeks. There are more or less some conditions for resolving the crux of the problem on the Korean peninsula. First of all, the prime ministers of South and North Korea meet in Seoul in early September to exchange views on their respective stands on the primary national issue: namely, the reunification of Korea. A new round of talks is scheduled to be held in Pyongyang from 16 to 19 October. Two important events have taken place in the interval. The North Korean Government has expressed its preparedness to begin talks on establishing formal ties with Japan. Japan accepted the proposal in principle. Second, the Soviet Union established diplomatic ties with South Korea as of 30 September. Thus, the Moscow-Seoul interaction has been added to the Moscow and Pyongyang interaction for detente on the Korean peninsula.

It also must be pointed out that there are indications that China and South Korea are speeding up progress regarding bilateral relations. In a speech delivered in New York recently, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen said: The mutual contacts and trade between the social organizations of the two countries are conducive to bringing about a turn for the better in the situation on the Korean peninsula and its stability. According to reports by various news agencies, it is likely that the PRC and the Republic of Korea will establish consular relations as soon as the ongoing Asian Games in Beijing end.

In my opinion, it is necessary to note that, precisely contrary to the views maintained by some commentaries, the development of relations between two countries is not detrimental to their relations with a third country. When the Soviet Union and China move to improve their relations with South Korea, it will not impair their relations with North Korea and, moreover, will promote the fulfillment of the task of Korea's peaceful reunification. It is precisely on this account that Tokyo's plan to establish ties with Pyongyang will not harm the ties that it has established with Seoul. In other words, a brand new political situation is taking shape in the Far East. The development of this situation is not harmful to any country, but will benefit every country.

Concern Expressed Over Arms Race in Third World

LD1110150190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by A. Balusov: "Risky Gambles. The Arms Race Continues in the 'Third World'"]

[Excerpts] In the past few days certain mass media sources in the Arab countries have reported that Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Qatar are reviewing their relationship with the Arab Military Industry Organization [AMIO]. An official report on its revitalization is expected in the near future. [passage omitted]

It is possible that the report on the readiness of four Arab states to breathe new life into the AMIO would not have attracted any particular attention if it had come two or three months before, or if the matter had only concerned those countries.

The decision by Egypt's former partners to change their relationship with Egypt at this time, after unsuccessful attempts by the Egyptians over many years to convince them of the need to revitalize cooperation within the framework of the organization, testifies to the fact that a change in military and political guidelines is occurring in the region under the influence of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, when a real danger has threatened the oil-rich Arab countries of the Persian Gulf. As far as the consequences of such a decision are concerned, a broader view of things shows that what is involved here is a highly dangerous trend that has recently become widespread not just in the Arab countries, but also in the "Third World" as a whole. This trend is connected with the arms race that is gaining in force and speed and is embracing the developing countries.

The French journal LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE cites facts from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute which demand that this problem be looked at in a new light. At least 10 countries now have programs to develop ballistic missiles. They include Egypt, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, and others. According to the institute's assessments, 12 "Third World" countries will acquire the possibility of manufacturing nuclear weapons in the next few years, or are trying to obtain the materials and resources necessary for this purpose.

A recent report from Brazil could not fail to draw the world community's attention in this respect. It follows from this report that that Latin American country has been carrying out work to develop nuclear weapons for some time now.

Do we need to talk about what the proliferation of mass destruction weapons and delivery vehicles could lead to? The events in the Persian Gulf are clearly demonstrating the consequences that mankind could suffer if new lethal weapons fall into the hands of arrogant, ambitious leaders, who are no rarity in the "Third World." The proliferation of state-of-the-art weapons is enabling developing countries to wage protracted, large-scale wars, creating preconditions for the emergence of "Third World superpowers" with their own particular spheres of influence and giving rise to new conflicts and new problems. [passage omitted]

In this connection it is probably time to start thinking about the creation of effective international mechanisms to monitor the nonproliferation of mass destruction weapons and delivery systems. It is also time to think about determining criteria for defense sufficiency. USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze spoke about this in his address at the 45th UN General Assembly session. In the world of today, which is so interlinked and so interdependent, the level of armaments of a particular country cannot remain its own exclusive right and prerogative. This could cost the world too high a price. The arms game could turn out to be too risky.

United States & Canada

Ryzhkov Meets With American Financiers

LD1110175190 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov today received a group of leading American financiers, led by board chairman of the New York Stock Exchange John Phelan.

Greeting the financiers, Ryzhkov expressed satisfaction that the meeting signified the start of cooperation between the USSR and the United States in a new sphere: the use of a financial market and stock exchanges for the balanced and stable development of the national economy.

Phelan noted that the American participants in a Soviet-American seminar on this topic, which was held in Moscow, were impressed by this forum.

The seminar strengthened their readiness to assist Soviet partners [to] organise stock exchanges in the USSR as an important factor of a financial market.

The importance of the financial market is great, since it enables all participants in economic activities to draw necessary funds for expanding production, raising competitiveness of products and overcoming difficulties.

The American side proposed assistance in resolving organisational issues to establish a stock exchange in the USSR and obtaining the necessary technical equipment. The financiers also promised to help train Soviet specialists.

The sides discussed other matters to improve relations between the two nations.

Laptev, U.S. Official Discuss Ties, Reforms

LD1110152890 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Ivan Laptev, chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of the Union, today met Richard Schifter, U.S. assistant secretary of state.

At the request of the guest, Laptev informed him of the present political and economic situation in the Soviet Union and the place and role of parliament in the country's life.

Special attention was given to the transition of the Soviet economy to a market and the lawmaking activities of the Soviet parliament, the drafting of an exit and entry law, in particular.

Schifter pointed to a great U.S. interest in the success of political and economic reforms being effected in the Soviet Union and called for deeper parliamentary contacts between the two countries at various levels.

Some aspects of Soviet-American relations were also touched upon during the meeting.

Obukhov, U.S. Envoy Discuss Chemical Weapons Ban

LD1110203890 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister A. Obukhov received U.S. Charge d'affairs ad interim John Joyce today. They discussed matters to speed up the coordination of a multilateral convention on a chemical weapons ban.

TASS Announces U.S. Secretary Cheney's Visit

LD1110175490 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—It was announced here today that in keeping with an earlier agreement U.S. Secretary of Defence Richard Cheney will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet defence minister, Marshal Dmitry Yazov, in the middle of October.

Pentagon Book Perpetuates 'Myth' of Soviet Threat

PM0810132590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by candidate of philosophical sciences Colonel V. Danilov: "Soviet Military Threat: Myth or Reality"]

[Text] The U.S. Defense Department has published the latest edition—the ninth—of the brochure "Soviet Military Power." The edition's tone and content reflect to a certain extent the changes taking place in today's world. At the same time, it is still strongly influenced by outmoded cliches and stereotypes. This contradiction is expressed quite clearly even in the foreword written by Defense Secretary Cheney. The present brochure, he stresses, "will not give great support either to the opinion of those who are sure that the Soviet Union is no longer a threat to Western interests or to those who regard the Soviet threat as virtually unchanged."

The brochure has seven chapters. Chapter one draws the conclusion, based on an analysis of the military-political and military-strategic situation in the world today, that the USSR is still the only country with a nuclear arsenal capable of destroying the United States and its allies and that Soviet military power remains the most important factor in the world arena.

Chapter two is dedicated to Soviet foreign policy. It notes that the Soviet leadership, in accordance with the concept of the new political thinking, is striving to find ways for a constructive solution of contemporary problems. Particular emphasis is laid on the significance of Soviet-U.S. contacts at various levels, including the "unprecedented program of meetings and exchanges of delegations" between the two countries' military representatives. Unfortunately, the authors of the brochure have not refrained from some of the standard charges against the USSR, in particular those connected with the Soviet side's alleged violations of the terms of the ABM Treaty, the Convention on Biological Weapons, and so forth. Nevertheless, it is stated that Soviet foreign policy is "less threatening in character" and that the likelihood of conflict between the USSR and the United States is at its lowest level since the war.

The main content of the next chapter is an analysis of contemporary Soviet military policy and military doctrine. This is the first time that such a publication admits the reality of the USSR's switch to a "more defensive doctrine," but at the same time it expresses concern at its efforts aimed at a "sharp qualitative improvement" of the Armed Forces based on modern technologies. Such fears are hardly justified and, furthermore, are refuted by the brochure's own table giving a comparative assessment of the development level of the technologies built into the deployed weapons systems. According to the figures cited, the Soviet Union lags behind the United States in 17 areas in this regard and leads it in only five.

Chapter four is devoted to the economic bases of Soviet military power. It presents the USSR as "a giant rich in resources but bogged down in the quagmire of an inefficient economy and social problems." In these conditions, a redistribution of economic resources is taking place, including the reduction of military spending. Emphasis is placed on the difficult position of Soviet military production's industrial base, and attention is drawn to the unresolved problems and complexities in the educational system and the ethnic and demographic spheres, with the concomitant adverse effect on staffing the Soviet Armed Forces.

The next two chapters examine the USSR's nuclear forces, strategic defense forces, space forces, and general purpose forces and also the Soviet-U.S. military balance. As a result of the analysis the conclusion is drawn that the Soviet Union and the United States "retain a relative parity on nuclear charges." In the authors' view, the USSR remains the leading nuclear power in Europe and Asia.

The final chapter deals with prospects for the future and the possible reaction to the rapidly changing international situation which is creating for the United States and the West not only favorable opportunities but also a risk arising from the fact that the Soviet Union, while "overburdened with deep problems," still owns a vast nuclear and conventional military potential.

On the whole, the latest edition of "Soviet Military Power" is considerably different from all previous ones and reflects the positive changes in U.S. public perception of the USSR and its defense policy. At the same time, the initial concept of the brochure as an instrument of "concentrated propaganda" prevents it from adequately reflecting the fundamental changes taking place in the Soviet Union or overcoming confrontational approaches. That is why the authors' attempts to preserve the "frightening" myth of the "Soviet military threat," albeit in updated and scaled down form, looks so unconvincing and outmoded.

U.S. Said To Want Soviet Spacecraft Reactor

PM1010134590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report under the "News In Brief" section: "United States-USSR"]

[Text] The possible purchase of a Soviet "Topaz" nuclear reactor is currently being considered by U.S. specialists. The newspaper SPACE NEWS reported that officials responsible for the development of nuclear reactors for spacecraft are currently seeking permission to purchase a "Topaz" reactor. "Representatives of the Department of Energy, the USAF, and the SDI Organization would like the U.S. Government to acquire a Soviet-made reactor," the newspaper writes.

Aeroflot May Buy or Lease U.S. Aircraft

PM1110130990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "United States": "Lockheed in Our Country"]

[Text] In the U.S. city of Miami (Florida) representatives of two air transport companies in the USSR and the United States—Aeroflot and Eastern Airlines—are negotiating the conclusion of a contract which could be worth more than $150 million.

They are discussing the possibility of Aeroflot's buying or leasing 13 wide-bodied L-1011 passenger aircraft built by California's Lockheed Corporation.

The airliners in question are not new, for they are already between 13 and 18 years old. Lockheed—one of the Pentagon's biggest contractors—stopped building them in 1983 because it had concluded that the competitive struggle in the civil aircraft field was unprofitable. According to independent specialists—for example, George Pearson of the Washington consultative firm of Airline Economics—the model itself was highly successful.

The U.S. company is asking between $12 and $14 million for each airliner.

Coalition in Support of Joint U.S. Trade Treaty

LD1210094490 Moscow TASS in English 0928 GMT 12 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington October 12 TASS—A coalition in support of the American-Soviet Trade Treaty, signed on June 1st, during the Washington summit, will be set up here shortly, it has been announced here. The coalition will coordinate the efforts of American companies to secure its ratification. The treaty envisages a substantial (?expansion) of commercial relations between the two countries.

The United States is making its ratification conditional on the adoption of an emigration law in the Soviet Union.

"The American-Soviet treaty is the most comprehensive and efficient commercial agreement ever," said Kempton Jenkins, senior vice-president of the Washington business consultation firm Arnold and Porter, on which the coalition will be based. He believes its ratification is obstructed by "ideological and political motives and human rights considerations," not commercial reasons. Their elimination will mark the first important step towards developing comprehensive commercial relations between American corporations and Soviet partners.

Former secretary of commerce in the Reagan administration Willian Verity supported the new organisation. He said efforts by U.S. businessmen were vitally necessary to secure the treaty's ratification.

The weight of private interests is borne out by the fact that several other such (?treaties) including the Free Trade Agreement between the United States and Canada, were ratified by the U.S. Congress only after protracted talks involving representatives of the country's business circles.

The coalition's leadership includes Congressman Don Bonker and former U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union Arthur Hartman.

China

Conference on China Opens in Moscow

LD0910194790 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 9 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow October 9 TASS—The first international conference "China and Socialism: Chinese economy, politics, history and culture", which opened at the Far East Institute here today, is devoted to the study of contemporary China, its past and future.

One of the main aims of the conference which is being attended by over 50 Soviet Orientalists and their colleagues from China, Poland, Cuba and Mongolia, is to describe China's role and tasks in the modern world.

Addressing the conference, leading Soviet Orientalist Sergey Tikhvinsky noted that these issues should be examined not only with respect to present-day realities but also in terms of distant prospects.

Greeting conference participants, Professor Mao Tianqi, deputy director of the Chinese Economics Institute, stressed the importance of the forum as "the first Soviet conference where opinions will be exchanged on virtually all aspects of Chinese society's life".

Speaking about China's problems as a socialist state, professor Mikhail Titarenko, director of the Far Eastern Institute, noted that socialism in China, as well as in other countries, is living through a crisis.

However, this "does not mean an end to the socialist idea as such, since socialism has nothing to do with it embodiment in the form of 'barrack-like' socialism".

He called on scientists "to examine lessons learnt from mistakes in choosing strategy and tactics of socialist construction".

The conference will continue work in groups over the next two days.

Ministerial Talks With China Show Cooperation

OW1010162690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1200 GMT 6 Oct 90

[Commentary by station observer Alekseyev from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Dear listeners, the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and China held a meeting at the office of China's permanent representative to the United Nations. Alekseyev, an observer of this station, has the following comments on the meeting:

Considering the Soviet Union's and China's weight and role in world affairs, it is very necessary for the foreign ministers of the two countries to regularly exchange views and consult with each other on issues of interest to both countires. The last meeting between Shevardnadze and Qian Qichen was held in Harbin from 31 August to 1 September. This meeting was held amid the tense situation caused by the Gulf crisis.

Iraq's invasion of its neighbor Kuwait is a blatant challenge to the international community, which has nearly unanimously opposed the invasion. It seems that Iraqi President Saddam Husayn did not expect this. He seemed to have underestimated the effects of the change in the [words indistinct] of international relations. You may still remember how the Soviet Union, China, the United States, and other Eastern and Western countries would respond in the 1970's when a conflict erupted in a certain area. When a conflict took place at that time, charges such as sabotage by Moscow, hegemonic contention between the two superpowers, and imperialist plots and tricks would spread immediately, and the parties concerned would try to bring such charges against each other. At that time all of the initiators of conflict made use of such a mentality. But now the situation has changed. Of course, it is very important for the Soviet Union and China to have a completely identical stand on the Gulf crisis. Especially notable is that the two countries have adopted an attitude toward the crisis that shows a great sense of responsibility. Both countries have done their best to prevent the crisis from developing into an armed conflict. So, Shevardnadze and Qian Qichen's meeting in New York was very important. At the meeting, the two foreign ministers discussed the Gulf situation in detail.

Since they met in Harbin, the two countries' stands on the Cambodian issue have been in line with each other. What I mean is that the Soviet Union and China, together with the three other UN Security Council permanent members, have drawn up a plan to solve the issue. However, this does not mean that the two countries no longer have any differences on all issues; there still are differences. This is quite natural. However, the important thing is that the both sides no longer regard these differences as an obstacle to cooperation. Both sides now believe that cooperation is of utmost importance.

New Ambassador Appointed to China

PM1110203790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed "Chronicle" report]

[Text] The president of the USSR has appointed Nikolay Nikolayevich Solovyev USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the PRC.

The president of the USSR has released Oleg Aleksandrovich Troyanovskiy from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the PRC in connection with his retirement.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Trade Groups View Soviet Market

91UF0006A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by V. Sbitnev: "The Japanese Are Studying Their Partners"]

[Text] **Two extraordinary Japanese assault units landed in Irkutsk. One of them, with over 200 people, brought an exhibition of Japanese coastal trade items. The other unit of 60 people came with a high-level economic mission, and before Irkutsk they also visited Vladivostok and Khabarovsk.**

Two Japanese foreign trade associations "Ayast" and "Sotobo," together with our "Dalintorg," organized the exhibition of goods presented by 182 firms. It was the largest exhibition of its kind.

Business people came here from many regions of Siberia, and what they saw was technology one or two levels higher than their own. Why is it that the Japanese can make such cars, shoes, vacuum-cleaners, electronic goods, etc. and we cannot? Will we ever be able to have something similar, and how can we achieve it? It is impossible to ask ourselves such questions without feeling a certain anxiety or irritation. It was not for nothing that one of the oblast leaders told me that the show was meant to "tease" our administrators and to make them take a critical look at themselves. The exhibition seems to have worked in that respect rather well. But there is another side to it, too. The Japanese are prepared to sell us their goods, but we are not prepared to pay dollars for them. And so for a long time yet the Siberians will not see anything other than the show samples. The Japanese are in no hurry to set up joint ventures and invest their money in them.

What makes our neighbors so cautious? Many things. The economic delegation, which included the cream of the Japanese business world, visited several industrial enterprises in the oblast. Their conclusion: Russians fail to realize some 30 to 50 percent of profits solely because of negligence and mismanagement. How can one conduct serious business with them?

It was surprising for the Japanese to see that we are trying to grab foreign investments, create joint ventures, set up free enterprise zones, and envision an outlet for our production on the world market without first introducing some kind of order in the production organization, without ensuring discipline and proper job safety, and without systematizing wages. As our visitors see it, our understanding of the joint venture concept skips over two or three stages at least, which must be gone through before a competitive joint venture can be set up. The delegation members were quite positive that at least a third of our enterprises can be managed a lot more reasonably already, without involving any foreign investments. They only have to believe in their own resources and possibilities and change the thinking of their employees.

This considerable difference in assessment and perception was comprehensively described by the leader of an electronic firm as he spoke about his impressions during the summing up:

"Your notions and ours differ greatly. Take, for instance, an ordinary elevator. Your elevators vibrate as they move up or down, they go in jerks, they are noisy. It seems that we are talking about one and the same thing, but we mean something different."

The guests and hosts also varied in their idea of resources. The hosts, as usual, presented their old concept of utilizing the untold natural resources of the region, which to them meant its development. The guests rejected this position at once as erroneous and futile. In their opinion the main resource, if not the only one, is a person, endowed with education and intellect. In today's Japan so-called think-tanks multiply from day to day, and intellectual activity is becoming one of the leading and growing commodities.

I am not sure that our leaders evaluated this information correctly. Here is a fact quoted at one of the meetings. A major enterprise of the oblast earned several hundred thousand dollars in other countries and purchased 100 foreign-made cars for their employees. When the managers were told that they could have used the money to send 35 young people to study in another country, they answered that the idea never occurred to them. The commentary of the Japanese was quite categorical—such squandering of money was impossible in their country. Their advice to the Siberians was to pay more attention to educating and training young people rather than to the material-production sphere. Then they will at least have a hope of improvement. The main actor at an enterprise, our guests reiterated several times, is not material wealth, machines, or technology, but people.

The Japanese businessmen were amazed at the Siberians' insistence that their situation would be improved by the help of Japanese firms and not by starting the process of self-development. Our visitors are guided by a different rule: Rely primarily on your own forces. Our neighbors are not against close cooperation, but they say that their large firms would venture into contacts with our industries only after we create a guarantee system for their investments.

In that respect the Japanese are looking forward to President M. Gorbachev's visit to their country. Hopefully it will make it possible to bring our still dissimilar basic notions to a common denominator and to hear each other better. The current economic mission, which went from here to survey the situation in Yakutiya, came here with the purpose of clarifying for Japanese business circles our preparedness and our potential for cooperating in reality and not only on paper.

Sale of Nuclear Reactors to DPRK Viewed

901UF0017A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 40, 3 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA staff correspondent Valeriy Sharov in the Far East: "Reactors... on Credit"]

[Text] During his recent trip to the Far East, B. Yeltsin was asked a question which puzzled the Russian leader:

"Is it true that our country has sold four nuclear reactors to the DPRK?"

The head of the Russian parliament answered that he knew nothing about this, but admitted that this was a serious issue.

Quite recently it became known in Vladivostok that surveying work for the construction of a nuclear power station has already begun in North Korea. They also succeeded in determining the number of a contract, 85-011/57000, for engineering and hydrometeorological prospecting signed by the Atommash [Sverdlovsk Nuclear Equipment Plant] with the marine prospecting and surveying party of the Far East Production Association "Dalmorgeologiya." Therefore, the reactors may be delivered to the DPRK very soon, if they have not been sold already.

Certainly, there is nothing bad about a great power which has made strides in nuclear power generation helping a novice in this endeavor. However, first, as Li Zu-O, chief of the oceanography department of the DPRK Hydrometeorological Service, said, construction is proceeding on credit, which is at the very least strange, given the USSR's current most difficult economic situation. Secondly, it is planned to site the station at the East Korean Bay of the Sea of Japan, which is where the center of cyclones in the Pacific Region is located in winter. The elements emerging here go on to pound our Bering Sea and the Sea of Okhotsk and their shores. Meanwhile, the discharge of hot water into the sea by the future station may bring about a temperature change on the surface of the bay and, accordingly, substantially influence the intensity and frequency of the cyclones themselves.

On top of this, the secrecy in which the construction of the future nuclear power station is shrouded is very frightening: Neither the broad circles of Soviet public nor, as it turns out, the Russian leader are aware of it.

Prokofyev Leads Delegation to Mongolia

LD1210095390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 12 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 12 Oct—Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat, chairman of the Mongolian Peoples' Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee, met here today with Yuriy Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee, and had a friendly conversation with him.

The leader of Moscow communists is here as head of the Soviet capital's party delegation within the framework of direct interparty links betwen the CPSU and the MPRP.

Ochirbat and Prokofyev exchanged information on the political processes underway in the two countries, and openly shared opinions and evaluations. The two sides favor developing links between the CPSU and the MPRP.

Mongolia Criticizes Soviet Economic Deals

90US1335A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 3

[Article by L. Arikh: "Debtors and Creditors—Reflections on a 'Delicate' Subject"]

[Text] Ulaanbataar-Moscow—History so ordered it: From the very first years following the October Revolution, the Soviet Union and Mongolia have assisted one another in everything. International cohesion was the basis for the victory at Khalkhin-Gol. Hundreds of plants and factories have been constructed through common labor.

Mongolia in turn extended to us its hand of assistance during the years of the Great Patriotic War. How many of our soldiers have been kept warm by those sheepskin coats! Giving their all, Arats [Mongolian peasants] collected funds to build a column of tanks and squadron of aircraft. When the calamity occurred in Armenia, Mongolia again rushed to share everything it could with us.

Until recently we spoke only of gains in cooperation. But have there been losses? Now the question is being raised in this vein. The first critical arrows were shot mainly at joint Soviet-Mongolian enterprises. It was asserted, for example, that their efficiency amounts to zero, that as a result of sharing production output only the Soviet side allegedly is profiting.

Especially zealous in this regard are the informals—what have they not hung out on the squares! That "Mongolia is under the oppression of an empire," of some kind of "secret agreements... signed under pressure exerted by the Soviet Union behind the backs of the Mongolian people."

Why have those who know the truth remained silent? For example, that the most beautiful Palace of Science, Technology, and Culture, erected in the center of the capital at a cost of more than 18 million rubles, is a gift. Almost two billion rubles worth of housing, schools, and other facilities of social and cultural application have been presented, constructed, or transferred gratuitously over the years of cooperation.

New leaders of the Mongolian People's Republic (MPR), replacing those who retired, have tried to correct this strange situation in which the real has given way to the imaginary. We recall the meeting between T. Gombosuren, MPR Minister of Foreign Affairs and member of the Politburo (now the Presidium) of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, with instructors and students of institutes of higher education in the capital. Just prior to it, a rally of informals had taken place in Ulaanbataar in which many thousands of people participated. It may be said that here, for the first time, the informals came out openly in opposition to Soviet-Mongolian cooperation. A "unique document" on the size of credits extended to a number of foreign countries by the Soviet Union, published in IZVESTIYA, turned out to be a real tempest in a teapot. The Mongolian debt was also mentioned here—9.5 billion rubles, second in size to Cuba. And a strange metamorphosis took place.

Those calling for publication of the amount of the debt to the Soviet Union suddenly began dancing in a different direction when the figure appeared in the Soviet press—as if it were not Mongolia which owed the Soviet Union, but rather the other way around. And so Gombosuren, responding to numerous tricky questions from that audience, termed the conjectures of the informals fabricated. He also stated that everyone knew about the "secret deals," and therefore there were—and are—no secrets at all.

In the end, Gombosuren could not refrain from the aphorism: "You do not sell out old friends, and new ones will be hard to find...."

One can go too far in the striving to call white black. Knowing that the Soviet Union has written off debts repeatedly, some Mongolian economists are attempting in one fell swoop to "write off," as it is termed, almost two million square meters of housing and more than 1,000 industrial, agricultural, and cultural facilities constructed and operating under our technical assistance. Joint enterprises are being "written off" which have increased the republic's export potential by more than 70 percent. This includes the "Erdenet" Ore Enrichment Combine, whose 2.5 billion tugriks introduced into the republic budget covers the total national income produced last year by the country's entire industry.

Also "written off," finally, is the very fact of selfless motives being present in the cooperation with Mongolia. But following a recent meeting between leaders of the two countries in Moscow, a certain portion of the 9.5 billion debt will undoubtedly again be written off or terms extended for a long period. Otherwise, in my opinion, the "open door policy" declared by Mongolia might, taking these debts into account, begin to skid or turn into a vehicle without a universal shaft.

We should not forget that, in addition to "daily bread," there are also considerations of a political nature. These too have most likely been taken into account by our countries over the course of almost 70 years of cooperation. It is these which highly likely prevailed when most-favored-nation status was established for our Mongolian partners. In the language of the economists, this includes the so-called hidden subsidizing of Mongolian exports, diverse incentive increments to contract prices for imported goods, the affording of trade credits, and a certain ignoring of the fact that rates of compensation established for Soviet specialists employed here are five to six times lower than for workers from other countries. Someone calculated that, were one to take these and many other facts into consideration, the total cost of the overall volume of Soviet assistance provided to Mongolia in the past 40 years alone would come to 15 billion rubles.

However, those who are convinced that now is not the time to dispute the exaggerated problem of who owes whom, are right. This does not mean, however, that the Soviet and Mongolian partners are refusing to recognize mistakes and miscalculations permitted in the past. Alas—these have taken place. They have been treated, and are being treated, at the highest level. We have spent without looking back, as the saying goes, without concerning ourselves with the effectiveness of capital investments which have been automatically increased.

This—is what was. And the most important thing now is not to allow a repetition of what was. At the outset, it is felt, Mongolia could not make do without external sources of subsidizing. But insofar as the affording of credits on our part will be inevitable, control of their distribution and use by the USSR Supreme Soviet should be equally inevitable.

The prospects for tomorrow's cooperation with Mongolia are quite promising. Relations must be fashioned on a mutually beneficial basis, with transition beginning in 1991 to world prices and calculations made in hard currency. It is not difficult to imagine that, for Mongolia, such a transition to new principles will entail a great many economic difficulties. But even in this event, I am certain that the Soviet Union, as opposed to a number of "vacillating" countries, will not abandon its old friend to misfortune.

Mongolian Parliament Approves New Cabinet

LD0510043190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1430 GMT 4 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev]

[Text] Ulaanbaataar, 4 Oct (TASS)—The second session of the Little Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic—the country's permanently operating parliament, which was formed by the country's permanently operating parliament, which was formed by the Great People's Hural after an interval of many years—ended today. The approval of the composition of the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic after a stormy and sometimes repeated hearing of candidates was its main result.

Representatives of four parties—the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Democratic Party, the National Progress Party, and "the Greens"—make up the new cabinet. It now has two doctors and six candidates of sciences, and the country's four nationalities are also represented. The absolute majority of the members of the government has a command of foreign languages; the youngest of them, Vice Premier D. Dorligjav, one of the leaders of the Democratic Party, is 31 years old, whereas the oldest, Minister of Defense Lieutenant General J. Jadambaa, is 50; the average age of the others is slightly over 40.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Politburo Member Views Party Conflicts

LD0810221890 Moscow TASS in English 2045 GMT 8 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Pavel Bogdanov and Aleksandr Frolov]

[Text] Phnom Penh October 8 TASS—The activity of the Liberal and Social Democratic Party (LSDP) was directed against the ruling People's Revolutionary Party (PRP) and the existing political regime in the country, a member of the PRP Politburo has told TASS.

Mat Ly said the LSDP, which was dissolved three months ago, had been founded by "political adventurers who launched preparations for a coup under cover of democratic slogans".

Observers here say that the LSDP had no organisations in the provinces and that its backbone comprised six people, led by Minister of Communications, Transport, and Posts Ung Phan.

The formation of the LSDP reflected liberal sentiments of some officials and intellectuals in the capital in the period when economic reforms were being launched and the diplomatic dialogue was being held with the opposition.

Mat Ly said the "illegal foundation of the LSDP complicated the already difficult position of Cambodia, which could lead to a return of the Pol Pot clique. The decision to dissolve the LSDP was based on the Cambodian constitution, which does not contain an article on political pluralism."

Ung Phan was expelled from the PRP at the 11th plenum of the party's Central Committee in July for "betraying the cause of the PRP and the people" and relieved of his duties, Mat Ly said.

"LSDP members are now taking re-education courses," which "will help them begin to see things clearly and take the correct position," the politburo member said, adding that the Interior Ministry was simultaneously investigating their activity.

"The situation in Cambodia is complicated by corruption among officials. Efforts to clear party and state power bodies have been increased of late," he said.

"The Chairmen of the People's Committees in Takeo and Kompong Speu Provinces and a number of other high-ranking officials were convicted of corruption. All of them have been punished by party organizations and removed from their posts."

Transportation Venture Developed With Singapore

PM0510151390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by V. Chebakov under the rubric "For the First Time": "Surface Skimmer Into the Future"]

[Text] Designers at the P.O. Sukhoy Experimental Design Bureau have begun developing and creating a new means of transport—a surface skimmer [ekranolet]. This is being done within the framework of the Soviet-Singapore joint venture "Far East Aeroconversion." Documents instituting it were signed recently. "What is a surface skimmer?" "Why do the words 'Far East' feature in the joint venture's name?" The leaders of the joint venture answer these and other questions.

"We saw a model of a small surface skimmer recently at an aviation exhibition in Singapore," Mikhail Simonov, general designer at the Sukhoy Experimental Design Bureau, said. "It had been designed by U.S. designers for the firm of Aeromarine Singapore. And in the Soviet Union the well-known designers Rostislav Alekseyev and Robert Bartini had long been developing the idea of creating such technology.

"The theory and experiments show that extremely low-altitude flight over water significantly enhances a craft's aerodynamic qualities and reduces drag. As a result, a flying craft becomes 50-100 percent more economical than an aircraft. At the same time surface skimmers can fly at a speed of 400-600 km per hour. Our technologies and design potential today make it possible to organize within the framework of conversion the continued production of 30-40-seat passenger surface skimmers or freight skimmers for long-range flight. In general, there are no limits on size for this transport, and so it is possible to develop eventually surface skimmers comparable with modern ocean liners."

[Chebakov] Why has Singapore been chosen as a partner?

[Simonov] The point is that in that country, just as in South Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, very high demands are made of joint ventures. In order for the founders to be able to register them, they must prove that the standard of their technologies and their ideas are the most advanced in the world. This is why, following Japan, these countries have made a giant leap forward over the past quarter-century not only in the sphere of electronics but also in technology in general. And this exactingness regarding technical standards and innovation greatly impresses our collective of developers.

And the geographic location is another reason. Southeast Asia is made up of small and large islands and archipelagoes. Communications do not pose a difficulty for Europe and America—there are railroads, road transport, aircraft. But what about mountainous islands? A ship can carry a large load, but its speed at sea is limited to 20-30 miles per hour. An aircraft is faster but is dependent on the weather and requires good airfields. The surface skimmer has the load-carrying capacity and comfort of the maritime fleet, and the speed and range of aircraft. It is less dependent on the weather. Surface skimmers fly over the waves, but no rocking can be felt in them. Nor are there "air pockets," as on a bumpy aircraft flight.

The creation of such transport is part of the conversion process, and our experimental design bureau has begun work in conjunction with designers of the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry, the Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute, and the Siberian Aviation Institute. We will call the first model "Singoplane...."

[Chebakov] So what is it—an aircraft or a ship?

[Simonov] A happy combination of both. [Simonov ends]

A paradox. An experimental design bureau famous throughout the world for its combat aircraft and currently developing a supersonic passenger aircraft and other kinds of civilian aviation technology—and suddenly a marine aircraft....

"Where will production of the 'Singoplanes' be started up?" I asked George Wu, president of the firm of Aeromarine Singapore.

"I believe it will be both in the USSR and in Singapore. But the first series machines, their development, testing, and building will be carried out by the Soviet side. We are taking on the marketing and the operation of surface skimmers on regional routes with the optimum range. In addition, we will sell this technology to third countries. After conducting a feasibility study of the new transport, we reached the conclusion that surface skimmers are cheaper than hydroplanes, more economical, and more easily serviced. But the most important points are their load-carrying capacity, comfort, speed, and also their ability to unload in ports, on shore and on water."

Near East & South Asia

Reports Continue on Jerusalem Killings

Moscow Palestinian Group Demonstrates

LD1110213390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Excerpt] A sanctioned protest took place today in Moscow against the crimes of Israeli punitive forces in the Israeli occupied Palestinian territories. Our correspondent Sergey Krylov reports:

[Krylov] The Association of Support for the Palestinian Intifada is the sponsor of the protest outside the Israeli Consulate General on Bolshaya Ordynka Street. This student organization unites not only Palestinian and Arab students and post-graduates in the USSR, but also representatives of other foreign student asosciations in Soviet institutions of higher education.

What are the protest's participants demanding? Maybe the liquidation of the state of Israel? No. They are demanding a stop to the bloody repressions against their brothers and sisters in their occupied homeland; for a chance to be given to the Palestinian people, in accordance with international law and UN resolutions; for a real chance of self-determination and the creation of a national independent state in their homeland. I look at these Palestinian youths and I am thinking how difficult it is for them to hold back their pain and anger. They are, actually, themselves feeling part of the heroic Palestinian intifada which has been going on for 35 months already. Yet, there is no sign of them being unrestrained. On the contrary, they are restrained and disciplined. This kind of composition and restraint is their worthy answer to the indiscriminate shooting on Monday by Israeli punitive forces on Palestinians at prayer on the esplanade between two sacred mosques in the old part of Jerusalem. There was no need to ask the opinion of the participants of the protest demonstration outside the Israeli consulate. It is quite clear. [passage omitted]

Asian-African Group Condemns Israel

LD1110164190 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—The Soviet Asian and African Solidarity Committee released today a statement condemning the bloodbath by Israelis in eastern Jerusalem.

"The entire world is indignant at the cruelty of Israeli authorities and condemns their actions, which contravene international law and basic human rights, above all the rights to life," the statement says.

The committee demanded that the Israeli government end crimes against the Arab people of Palestine.

Iraqi Envoy Says Soviet Citizens Offer Aid

PM1210105590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by V. Filin: "Volunteers for Husayn"]

[Text] It has emerged that Saddam Husayn has not only opponents in our country. According to a statement by Ghalib al-Tamimi, counselor at the Iraqi Embassy in the USSR, more than 100 messages have been received from USSR citizens offering to render Iraq assistance "in its struggle against imperialism," up to and including personal participation in combat operations. But so far there is no need for that....

Soviet Muslims Decline Invitation To Visit Iraq

LD1110170290 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Vinogradskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—The Muslim Board of Transcaucasia has firmly declined an invitation from the Iraqi Committee for Friendship, Peace and Solidarity to visit Iraq in order to support the Muslims of Iraq "in the hour of need".

"The peoples of Transcaucasia cannot consider Iraq a Muslim state, since it acted as aggressor by attacking defenseless and peaceloving Kuwait," reads the official reply from the Soviet Muslims of Transcaucasia.

The document, circulated here today, also points out that Soviet Muslims recognise "only the government of Shaykh Jabir al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah, the Emir of Kuwait."

Lebanese Official Condemns Iraqi Invasion

LD1110204190 Moscow TASS in English 1913 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Mustafa Sa'd, chairman of Lebanon's Nasserite Popular Organisation, expressed support for the Soviet Union's detente policies as regards the United States and European countries at a meeting with representatives of the Soviet public today.

Mustafa Sa'd arrived in Moscow on Wednesday at the invitation of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee.

Mustafa Sa'd said the situation in Lebanon remains complicated and tense. He told TASS that the warring Islamic and Christian groups must make concessions in order to resolve the Lebanese crisis. The solution of the Lebanese crisis is linked to the settlement of the Middle East problem as a whole, he said.

Mustafa Sa'd said that the Nasserite Popular Organisation condemns the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. He noted, however, that the aggression does not warrant the United States sending troops into the region. He said the U.S. took advantage of the Gulf crisis to establish its domination over the region's oil reserves.

As regards relations with the Soviet Union, Mustafa Sa'd said that they are friendly and marked by political interaction. He also expressed the hope that economic relations between the Soviet Union and Lebanon will develop.

Commentator Urges Dialogue To Solve Gulf Crisis

LD0910173890 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 9 Oct 90

[Commentary by Mikhail Mayorov—read by announcer]

[Text] More and more observers are inclined to believe that a Gulf war is inevitable. The whole thing is when the first shot is to be made. On News and Views on Monday we brought you exactly such a view but our commentator Mikhail Mayorov disagrees and this is what he writes.

This seems to be the first time humanity faces such a situation. The aggressor country, Iraq, has been condmned by a majority of nations. The world community has displayed rare unity as it is pressing through collective sanctions to have the situation restored in the Gulf, the situation that existed before 2 August when Kuwait's sovereignty was violated. To prevent aggression from spreading, troops of the United States, Britain, and other countries have been moved into the area. The guns of a multinational flotilla are ready to fire.

But is the time right for driving a wedge with a wedge, as the Russian saying goes? Is it not amoral to resort to such methods in general in the struggle against aggression? An economic and air boycott of Iraq is in effect. It was naive to expect immediate results the very next day. In this extraordinary situation it is necessary to be calm, restrained, and single-minded.

It is certainly expensive for the taxpayer of the countries involved to keep troops and combat vehicles in the sands of Saudi Arabia but if the non-military sanctions are lifted will it not bring about military actions, instead of counting dollars, counting the dead Arabs, Americans, Britons, and men and women of other nationalities, including civilians? What will be the scale of the conflict if, say, chemical weapons are used? The situation is also delicate because the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq has brought the United Nations closer to the mark toward which they could have moved in other circumstances for years and even a decade.

The solidarity shown by a majority of countries is a unique phenomenon, speaking about the new shaping world order. The actual aim is to rule out aggression from international relations in any form in general. Having coordinated their peaceful actions against Iraq humanity has gained weighty political capital which may be hopelessly wasted if the first shot is fired in the Gulf area.

A dialogue is needed. One can understand the position of Washington or Paris, which refuse to hold talks with Saddam Husayn's regime unless the Iraqi troops have pulled out from Kuwait and the problem of hostages has been solved. But I am certain, writes our commentator, Mikhail Mayorov, that none of the sides will go back on its principles if contact is ultimately established with Baghdad.

With a dialogue the first shot will hardly be fired in the conflict area—a shot after which the situation will become unpredictable. At the same time it is only at the negotiating table that a formula may be reached acceptable to both sides to end the crisis—when justice is restored in the Gulf and tension is removed—that is caused by the standoff of the two military groupings. But I do not believe, concludes our commentator Mikhail Mayorov, that war is inevitable. In the long run the diplomats should have the final say not the guns of naval ships if humanity would like to punish the aggressor and not itself.

Linkage of Gulf, Palestinian Issues Argued

PM1110132790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by Konstantin Geyvandov: "Political Observer's Opinion": "Palestinians and the Persian Gulf Crisis"]

[Excerpts] Moscow-Tunis-Moscow—Since the defeat in the 1967 war with Israel, some Arab leaders have been dreaming of achieving strategic military parity with the Israelis in the hope of gaining revenge. I am no military expert, so I will not try to judge how far they have progressed along that path. But as far as parity is concerned, since the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait I can state that the thoughts and actions of the Iraqi leaders are of the same family as those of the Israelis in the latter half of the sixties.

The Arabs now have their own Ben Gurions and their own Dayans. According to the Iraqi leadership's 1990 scenario, which is practically identical to the 1967 war plan, the Kuwaiti problem has appeared in the Near East alongside the Palestinian problem. Israeli-occupied Arab territories have now been joined by the Arab-occupied Arab territories. Kuwaiti refugees have dispersed throughout the world and Kuwait has its own intifadah.

In short, through the efforts of Iraq's S. Husayn, the old Palestinian problem has acquired a new-born, but nonetheless twin brother in the shape of the Kuwait problem. The parallels are evident even to the naked eye. Therefore, it is no wonder everyone was surprised: Why are the Palestinians so well disposed toward the Iraqi president's actions? At least that is what many people among the Soviet public thought when they saw on television PLO Executive Committee Chairman Y. 'Arafat in Baghdad, embracing Iraqi leader Husayn (incidentally, it is a traditional ritual when Arabs meet—K. Geyvandov).

In the hope of clarifying this matter for my own benefit, I accepted the suggestion by the Soviet Committee for the Protection of Peace to visit Tunis at the PLO leadership's invitation as a member of a committee delegation in late September-early October this year. Since I have known many Palestinian figures for a very long time, this was one of the very first questions I put during the meetings and conversations with them in Tunis. They included Yasir 'Arafat (Abu-'Ammar), Salah Khalaf (Abu-Iyad), and 'Abd-al-Latif Abu-Hijlah (Abu-Ja'far), and others. [passage omitted]

During the conversations, our Palestinian interlocutors told us of their plans to secure support for a six-point program for the peaceful settlement of the Kuwait crisis. The principal point in the program is the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwaiti territory and the restoration of the country's sovereignty. Then there would be Iraqi-Kuwaiti talks to eliminate existing differences between them, the release of all hostages—other countries' citizens—in Iraq and Kuwait, the withdrawal of foreign Armed Forces from the Persian Gulf region, and the elaboration of measures to safeguard security and the stability of oil supplies from the region. These proposals would appear to represent a good basis for talks.

The package also includes a point on guarantees by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council on convening an international conference to settle the Arab-Israeli crisis fully, including a just solution to the Palestinian problem. In my view, in the context of the proposed program for the elimination of the Persian Gulf crisis this linkage is perfectly legitimate, particularly against the background of what is happening in foreign lands occupied by Israel. It directly corresponds to the final statement by the participants in the meetings of foreign ministers of the 35 CSCE states, which says, in part:

"We wish to contribute to security and well-being in the region (the Near East) in order to strengthen peace, tolerance, stability, and economic cooperation and development as well. Therefore, we are fully resolved to support efforts to resolve conflicts in the region and to achieve a just, all-embracing, and lasting peace in acordance with resolutions adopted on this question by the UN Security Council." [passage omitted]

Saudi Prince Praises Resumption of Ties

LD1110145290 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Lebedev]

[Text] Dhahran October 11 TASS—The improvement of the world situation bodes well for a peaceful settlement of all problems, including those in the Middle East, Prince Muhammad Bin Fahd Bin 'Abd-al-Aziz, the emir of the eastern province of Saudi Arabia, told TASS today.

He voiced satisfaction with the results of the Helsinki Summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, emphasising that the Soviet stand on the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait has met with deep gratitude in Saudi Arabia.

The prince accused the Iraqi president of failing to realise the importance and irreversibility of the processes taking place in the world.

He described Iraq's annexationist and expansionist actions as an attempt to undermine the new world order, which is being established through the efforts of all countries and peoples, and the policy of mutual understanding based on the principles of peaceful coexistence and respect for international legal norms.

"To the detriment of the Iraqi people plunged into unceasing wars, Saddam Hussayn goes against the mainstream of history. But I am convinced that many leaders will be as foresighted in their actions as the Soviet president," the Saudi prince emphasised.

'Abd-al-Aziz pointed out that the war danger did not introduce serious changes to life in the eastern region of Saudi Arabia and that there is a business-as-usual atmosphere there.

He said that the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Kingdom and the Soviet Union inspires optimism and hope for close cooperation in the interests of Saudi and Soviet peoples and the whole world.

Iranian Elections of Council of Experts Viewed

NC1110130890 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] In Iran, the elections for the members of the Council of Experts—the supreme organization under the constitution, and a guardian of the religious regime—were held. On the basis of the mass media's assessment, the voters actively participated in the elections. The election of 76 persons out of a total of 100 nominees was thus made possible.

In most of the constituencies, Majlis deputies were elected. The elections that took place in Iran are not a normal phenomenon. The Council of Experts is one of the most influential organizations in the life of the government. In addition, these elections took place at a time when the rivalry between the proponents of the country's reconstruction and the conservative forces had escalated. Both sides were not against using the Council of Experts as an instrument for their own policies.

This rivalry was tangibly reflected, especially in the pre-electioneering campaign. However, on the eve of the elections, this rivalry assumed a more intense aspect, and even culminated in an exchange of blows between Majlis deputies. 'Elias Hazrati and Asadollah Bayat, the deputies of Rasht and Zanjan respectively, vehemently criticized the decision by the Council of Experts to officially endorse only 109 candidates from among 169 nominees for Majlis membership.

Asadollah Bayat said: In my opinion this is not an election, but a selection. The country's religious leader and the president issued statements warning people about transforming the canvassing campaign into a campaign for flights of fancy, or for settling personal scores. Ayatollah Khamene'i clarified that such rivalry or differences are typical only of Western-style democracy, in which people are ignorant of God or religion.

Now, the elections have ended. Who has been victorious? It is difficult to answer this question accurately at first glance. The commentaries by the leaders and the country's mass media regarding the outcome of these elections are basically general or propagandistic, and ignore the internal rivalry. However, the supporters of the country's reconstruction seem to have pushed the conservatives in the background in the Majlis.

The results of the elections reflect the changes in Iran's social and political life which were wrought when the new government came into power in the summer of last year. These developments manifested themselves in an increased desire for democratization of the country, for its extrication from isolation, and for a state of confrontation with the world around it.

In the context of such changes, the criticism of the Council of Experts' past performance has accelerated, delaying approval of the most important reforms, such as land reforms, or creating obstacles to it. It is obvious that the voters who elected the new members of the Council of Experts are expecting categorical and effective decisions in favor of the regime's liberalization and the amelioration of the workers' sorry plight.

Soviet social circles have followed intensively the course of the Iranian Council of Experts elections and are optimistic that the new membership of the Council of Experts will support the policy of consolidating and expanding the goodneighborly relations between Iran and the Soviet Union. This policy will be the response to the principle of the new political thinking.

Comparison of Gorbachev Talks With Omani Premier

PM0510092290

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 5 October 1990 in its Second Edition on page 1 carries a TASS report of a 4 October meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Omani Deputy Premier Qays 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Zawawi. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Reception of Omani Sultan's Representative," has been compared with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version publised in the 4 October Near East & South Asia section of the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 25, revealing the following variations:

Column one, paragraph one, sentence one of the item reads: [Text] Today USSR President... (deleting dateline)

Paragraph two, only sentence reads: ...content and has assumed a regular nature... (rewording)

Last paragraph, sentence one reads: ...that Oman responded well to the current... (rewording)

Sentence two reads: ...very best wishes.

The following were present: A.M. Belonogov; A.S. Chernyayev; N.M.'A. al-Shaykh; and M.N. al-Husawi. (adding paragraph)

Release of British Hostage From Lebanon Possible

NC1110135490 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Commentary by Andrey Vasiliyev]

[Text] The Iranian special emissary visited Beirut. As reported by the Lebanese newspaper AL-DIYAR, the emissary should be attending to the final details of the operations and an agreement for the release of the British hostage Terry Waite, who was abducted in Lebanon in 1987.

Bishop Terry Waite, who was himself a special emissary of the Church of England, is perhaps one of the most famous Britons who, by sheer misfortune, fell into the clutches of the Lebanese extremists. At the time of his abduction, a vehement hue and cry was raised, and since 1987, numerous unsuccessful efforts have been made to gain his release.

As can be gleaned from the many Lebanese newspapers, Terry Waite and the other hostages, have a real chance [for release]. As we are aware, all these hostages are in the clutches of the Shiite groups, foremost among them the Lebanese Hizballah. However, other groups exist. Iran has an absolute and direct influence on their activities. In addition, some of these groups have come into existence directly at Tehran's behest.

Under the extremely frigid conditions of Iranian-British relations during the past two years, primarily because of the Rushdie affair, the hope that the Iranian politicians would exert their influence in assisting in the release of the British hostages was nonexistent. However, circumstances have changed in a most unexpected manner.

On 27 September, the resumption of Tehran-London diplomatic relations was announced. In the past six months, rumors of a restoration of severed ties were heard, but it is clear that one of the most decisive factors which radically changed the situation in the Persian Gulf was the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. It is natural that Great Britain, in its decision against Iraq's action, should naturally lean closer to Iraq's former adversary, Iran.

Husayn al-Musawi, the leader of the Lebanese Hizballahis [as heard], announced that the resumption of severed ties stemmed from positive measures and will have a favorable effect on British interests as well as on the hostage issue. Regarding Syria, he said that it is the oldest Iranian ally and should stand to benefit as a result of the current changes and circumstances.

It is completely likely that the British hostages will eventually be released. The Persian Gulf crisis, it appears, could tilt favorably for those unfortunate civilians who have been suffering in incarceration for the past few years. However, has not their freedom exacted a very heavy price? Even though it is extremely regrettable and saddening, the result of one act of force should only be eliminated by the course of (?the abovementioned conditions) and by the consequences of another act of force. The end to this period of acts of force which is reigning over the Middle East, does not seem to be in sight.

The instigation of such misfortune and tribulations does not limit them only to the people in that region. These acts of force, as can be witnessed by the latest example, endanger worldwide peace, which may recently have warded off the threat of a nuclear holocaust. If the regional conflicts are not terminated, then these conflicts will transform all of us into hostages of meaningless and unwise acts of force.

Indian Ocean 'Naval Arms Race' Deplored

PM0910135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by correspondent N. Paklin: "Pakistani Nuclear Submarines in the Indian Ocean. Talks in Camera"]

[Text] Delhi—Citing Hong Kong's FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW, Indian newspapers have reported that Pakistan intends to buy a nuclear submarine from China. The transaction is not yet complete, however the secret talks between the two countries are at an advanced stage.

Reports indicate that this involves an improved version of the first generation of Chinese nuclear-powered submarines, built in the seventies. China has five of them. China intends to give Pakistan one of these. The price of the craft is $63 million without weapons. In the opinion of the Hong Kong journal, China needs this money to modernize its Navy—a program which has ground to a halt owing to lack of funds. There is another strategic aim. "If the Pakistani Navy can counter the Indian Navy, this will be to China's advantage," the journal writes.

The report of the impending Sino-Pakistani deal has aroused concern, if not alarm, in India. Experts from Delhi's Institute of Strategic Studies said that it would result in a change in the "regional balance of naval forces." In the opinion of Indian experts, the deal confirms the "close Sino-Pakistani cooperation in the military sphere." At present the Pakistani Army has Chinese aircrafts and tanks in its arsenal while the Navy has Chinese warships. Pakistani and Chinese specialists are developing a new tank together and working on the modernization of Chinese fighters.

But the Sino-Pakistani deal also raises other problems. Is it lawful to supply third countries with nuclear-powered submarines, albeit without nuclear weapons? Are such shipments not in breach of the provisions of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty? Is there a difference in principle between, say, a nuclear-powered icebreaker and an unarmed nuclear submarine, which can, however, easily carry both nuclear and conventional weapons?

These questions are by no means rhetorical for us: Not so long ago we leased India a nuclear-powered submarine on a long-term basis, providing the Indian crew with preliminary training. (I think that this was the first case in world practice). There is now talk of selling another Soviet nuclear submarine to India, the journal writes.

Soviet experts working in Delhi voice the opinion that a nuclear-powered submarine without nuclear weapons does not come under the provisions of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Nonetheless it is worth thinking about where nuclear submarines are concerned....

While beginning to expand their own naval presence, including nuclear submarines, Indian leaders would like to do to their utmost to restrict the Pakistani Navy. One of their arguments for this approach is the tremendous length of India's sea border, the existence of islands far from the mainland, the vast maritime economic zone, and a major merchant Navy. These are compounded by accusations leveled at Pakistan, inter alia, of being the first country in the region to begin developing a submarine fleet. Attention is also drawn to the rapid increase in surface vessels within the Pakistani Navy in 1989-1990. However, these arguments in favor of a naval arms race have not met with understanding in many countries adjoining the Indian Ocean. They are showing concern and beginning to expand their navies in turn. An alarming trend.

Afghan President Receives Roving Envoy

LD1010140290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1902 GMT 9 Oct 90

[Text] Kabul, 9 Oct (TASS)—President Najibullah of Afghanistan today received P.P Mozhayev, roving ambassador of the USSR foreign minister, who is here on a working visit. During the meeting which was attended by B.N. Pastukhov, USSR ambassador to Afghanistan, the expansion of direct cooperation between the Afghan provinces and the Soviet republics was discussed. Other matters of mutual interest were also touched on.

President Najibullah awarded P.P. Mozhayev the Order of Friendship of the Peoples of the Republic of Afghanistan, as a sign of gratitude for his activity in strengthening Soviet-Afghan friendship.

East Europe

Polish President Interviewed on Bilateral Ties

LD1110234890 Warsaw PAP in English 2135 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 11—Today's issue of "IZVESTIYA" daily carried an interview with Poland's President Wojciech Jaruzelski headlined "With the Sense of Fulfilled Duty." Following are excerpts of this interview:

"In face of various voices calling for the so-called acceleration that have been heard for some time now, a Sejm discussion on electoral time-table, presidential elections and constitution, I deemed it proper to suggest that my term be shortened. This does not mean an emergency situation in the system of ruling the state. Cooperation between the president, the Sejm and the government proceeds as usual. But we can move to the next stage. General presidential elections and then parliamentary elections will help assess the current degree of social support for individual political forces.

"Although the letter of the 'round table' has lost its validity, its spirit and the philosophy of dialogue and agreement should be kept. My proposal results from a realistic assessment of the situation and a sense of responsibility for the country's political stability and its further development. One of the most important tasks, now, is to reach the full parliamentary democracy and high economic efficiency.

"Anti-Soviet moods do not dominate in Polish society. They are a marginal and, unfortunately, greatly improper form of reacting to the years of silence, inequality and deformation in bilateral relations. I believe this will pass as in the rapidly changing Europe, partner-like, friendly relations are necessary for both Poland and the Soviet Union, as well as for our closest neighbours: Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania."

Polish Foreign Minister's Visit Continues

Interviewed on Relations

LD1110141190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2121 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Text] Warsaw, 10 Oct (TASS)—Soviet-Polish relations have significantly changed recently. This has occurred not only because Poland's sovereignty was restored with the coming to power of the present government in the country, but also in connection with big changes in the Soviet Union, which has taken the road of democratic reforms. This was stated in an interview to a TASS correspondent by Krzystof Skubiszewski, Poland's minister of foreign affairs, in connection with the commencement of his official visit to the USSR.

The basis has already been created for relations between Poland and the USSR on a partnership basis, he observed The new way of political thinking is developing in just this direction. However, there are still not altogether understandable delays in the economic sphere and in the resolution of joint problems concerning humanitarian issues. At the same time, the experience gathered by the two sides allows us to conclude that the process of restructuring of mutual contacts started a year ago will not only not slow down in the future, but will also gain a fresh impetus. The preservation of neighborly relations in the East continues for us to be a matter of extreme importance. I hope that in the long term cooperation will develop with mutual benefit for both sides, the minister said.

Speaking about the existing obstacles to the development of economic contacts, K. Skubiszewski stated in particular that the issue of mutual financial settlements remains, as before, unresolved. A way out of the deadlock facing the talks could fundamentally influence the state of cooperation in the economic sphere. I will not conceal that the changeover to hard currency settlements has posed serious problems for our economy, the consequences of which we cannot envisage even now. But this does not signify that our mutual relations are threatened with failure. I think, on the contrary, that this could create new prospects for their development in the light of those economic reforms which are expected to come into force in the USSR, he emphasized.

The minister noted, in characterizing the changes which are taking place in Europe, that in recent times, a fundamentally new situation has been created on the continent. Poland has become a sovereign country, carrying out an independent foreign policy, independently determining its own internal political structure and future. Undoubtedly these changes are of benefit to Poland, but at the same time, they also create new problems. We are having to learn how to be independent in circumstances when the country is burdened with the difficult legacy of the past.

The minister, in talking about cooperation between the two countries in the area of foreign policy, said that the viewpoints of Poland and the USSR frequently coincide during discussions at forums on a European and world scale. The USSR's support on the issue of Polish participation in the "two-plus-four" was exceptionally important for us, the minister noted.

Asked about the government's attitude to cases of dismantling monuments to Soviet liberating soldiers, K. Skubiszewski noted that the authorities resolutely condemn instances of vandalism and of desecration of the graves of Soviet soldiers. However, the overwhelming majority of reports on this theme do not correspond to the reality, in his opinion. There are in Poland many towns and villages which the Soviet Army saved from annihiliation. Krakow ranks first among these. The authorities view intentions to demolish monuments in these towns not only as a manifestation of disrespect to the liberators, but also as contemptuous toward Polish history. But, the minister noted, I would like Soviet people also to understand those Poles who view the Soviet Army not only as a liberator, but also as a force with who help a political system alien to Poles was introduced into the country.

In a Catholic country such as Poland, acts of desecration of graves are committed quite rarely, and they occur not only in relation to the graves of Soviet soldiers. Incidents of this kind are condemned both by the government and by the overwhelming majority of Poles, K. Skubszewski noted.

Meets Parliamentarians

LD1110212190 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Relations with the Soviet Union are a key element of our state strategy, Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski said during a meeting at the International Affairs Committee of the Soviet Parliament. Deputy chairman of the committee Anatoliy Ananiyev recalled that the USSR and Poland are good neighbours and will continue to be good neighbours for a long time to come. The Polish minister added: "We are neighbours forever".

Skubiszewski said that at the time when a new government was created in his country, the problem of a "new arrangement", as he put it, of Soviet-Polish relations was raised. The issue is being successfully tackled, although some obstacles and problems still remain.

Speaking about the development of relations between the two countries, the Polish foreign minister made special mention of economic relations. Soviet-Polish cooperation is living through a difficult period. However, we are optimistic about the perspective, Skubiszewski said.

The sides expressed satisfaction over the development of interparliamentary relations and stressed that the Soviet and Polish parliaments are doing much for shaping foreign policy of their respective states, so that it can promote the strengthening of Soviet-Polish relations.

Holds Talks With Shevardnadze

LD1110234990 Warsaw PAP in English 2225 GMT 11 Oct 90

["Skubiszewski, Shevardnadze Hold Talks"—PAP headline]

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 11—The talks were very successful. We reached progress on many significant matters. There are points about which we differ, but they do not overshadow the whole picture. We are glad that our relations develop in this direction," Krzysztof Skubiszewski said.

"The talks were very fruitful and proceeded in a constructive atmosphere marked by mutual goodwill. We reached agreement on many points which are very important for both sides," Eduard Shevardnadze said.

The two ministers epxressed these opinions after three-and-half-hour talks which were the main point of the second day of Skubiszewski's moscow visit.

Minister Skubiszewski suggested that Poland and the USSR should conclude a new treaty on cooperation and good neighbourly relations which would be the basis for the current Polish-Soviet relations.

In our cooperation we have departed from ideology and any forms of unilateral dependence, Skubiszewski said.

Undersecretary of State at the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations Dariusz Ledworowski told journalists that according to the information provided by the Soviet side, despite considerable drop in crude oil extraction, the USSR will be able to deliver to Poland 10 million tonnes of oil and 5.2 billion cubic meters of natural gas this year. Expected are the deliveries of one billion cubic meters of gas extra in exchange for foodstuffs.

Ledworowski said that the import of fuels was a subject of talks not only with central authorities of the USSR but also with Soviet republics.

It seems that there is also some progress concerning Polish officers murdered in the USSR. The Soviet side said that the investigation which up to now had been carried by three prosecutors offices, in Russia, Belorussia and the Ukraine was taken over by the military prosecutors office in Moscow, and personally, by Colonel Aleksandr Treteckyi.

The sides agreeded that talks concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland would be started still this year.

Among many matters as to which Poland failed to obtain unequivocal answers were the issue of the Kaliningrad District and Ribbentropo-Molotov Pact. The Soviet side addressed itself with understanding to Poland's fears of transforming the Kaliningrad District into autonomous German republic within the USSR but confined itself to a statement that the district continued to be a closed region. The USSR refused to recognize the whole Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, not only its secret protocols, as invalid, which Poland insisted on.

Ministers Focus on Joint Treaty

LD1110214790 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Talks have ended in Moscow between the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, and his Polish counterpart, Krzysztof Skubiszewski. The two men concentrated on a number of international as well as bilateral issues.

Later on Thursday [11 October] the Polish minister met members of the Soviet Parliamentary committee on international affairs. Skubiszewski described relations with the Soviet Union as the centerpiece of his country's strategy and spoke out for a new bilateral treaty to remove obstacles to further bilateral ties.

The Polish minister said his country was willing to promote relations with the Soviet constituent republics, above all the Russian Federation, Belorussia, and the Ukraine.

Tomorrow Skubiszewski is expected to attend a ceremony of signing a declaration establishing ties between the Russian Federation and Poland. Later he will visit Belorussia and the Ukraine.

Meets Gorbachev 12 Oct

LD1210102490 Moscow TASS in English 1008 GMT 12 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today met visiting Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski.

On Thursday, Skubiszewski held talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. The meeting was attended by experts on political, economic and humanitarian issues. The sides are now working on the text of the final communique.

Skubiszewski also held talks with the Soviet parliament's Committee for International Affairs. He told Soviet parliamentarians that relations with the Soviet Union are the most important element in Poland's state strategy.

On Friday, Skubiszewski will take part in the signing of the declaration on the establishment of relations between the Russian Federation and Poland.

Gorbachev Assesses Ties

LD1210112190 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1011 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Report on a news conference with President Gorbachev, prior to his meeting with visiting Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski, by Moscow correspondent Andrezej Siezieniewski—Gorbachev's comments in Russian with subsequent Polish translation; recorded]

[Text] This morning's part of the visit by Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski to the Soviet Union was taken up by two events. First, the head of our diplomatic service gave an hour-long lecture on the subject of the new Polish foreign policy at the Diplomatic Academy. Next, Foreign Minister Skubiszewski was received at the Kremlin by Mikhail Gorbachev. During a brief wait for the arrival of the Polish guest, we journalists took advantage of the occasion to ask the Soviet president about his view on the future of Polish-Soviet relations. Here is what he replied:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Irrespective of what is taking place both in our country and in yours, I hope that we will be able to gain control over the situation. We must demonstrate both character and invention in this so as to maintain our relations. [end recording]

And in association with this, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed: I have complete trust in the Polish nation. Let it choose for itself.

Greeting President Gorbachev, Skubiszewski passed on sincere best wishes to him from Wojciech Jaruzelski and Tadeusz Mazowiecki. Talks in a small circle commenced next, in which Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze is also participating on the Soviet side.

Mutual Concerns Reaffirmed

LD1110230890 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 2155 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Talks have taken place in Moscow between the foreign ministers of Poland and the Soviet Union. Following the talks, Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski told our correspondent:

[Begin Skubiszewski recording] We agreed that we need a new Polish-Soviet agreement—a new international Polish-Soviet treaty—which will regulate cooperation and good neighborliness on new principles meeting Poland's politics today. It should satisfy the changing foreign policy of the USSR and the internal transformations of both states. [end recording]

During the talks, some progress was noted as to the investigation concerning Polish officers murdered in the Soviet Union. Investigations conducted so far by three prosecutor's offices in Russia, Belorussia, and the Ukraine have been taken over by the military prosecutor's office in Moscow. It was agreed that talks concerning the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland will begin still this year. A meeting of experts on the simplification of border traffic is to take place in Moscow on 25 and 26 October. The opening of Polish consulates in Riga, Alma-Ata, and Vilnius was also discussed.

Among the many issues on which the Polish side failed to obtain unequivocal answers are the problems of the Kaliningrad Oblast and the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. The Soviet side showed an understanding of Polish fears about the transformation of Kaliningrad Oblast into a German autonomous republic, but restricted itself to emphasizing that this oblast continues to be closed. Moscow also did not agree to recognize the whole of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact as invalid from the start.

During the talks, Poland received assurances that she could expect the supply of 10 million tonnes of oil and five billion cubic meters of gas this year. Poland will also get one billion cubic meters of gas from the Soviet Union in exchange for food.

'No Political Obstacles' Seen to Poland Pullout

PM1110110190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

["Topical Interview" with Yu. Kashlev, USSR ambassador to Poland, at the "X tank formation test range," by nonstaff correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Ramazanov; date not given: "Not to Destroy, But to Create"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Yu. Kashlev, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Poland, has recently been to the X tank formation's test range to familiarize himself with the everyday life and military training of servicemen from the Northern Group of Forces. We are publishing the interview he gave here to Lieutenant Colonel A. Ramazanov, a nonstaff correspondent of ours.

[Ramazanov] Yuriy Borisovich, the idea has frequently been expressed recently that in implementing the economic reforms we are in practice being guided one way or another by the "Polish option." In this connection, what is your attitude to the "500 days" program?

[Kashlev] Let us ask ourselves the question: Can a good economic system be created in a precise timeframe? Precise to the day? Or in this case, to 500 days? Remember, the well-known "Balcerowicz plan" was to have solved Poland's economic problems in 100 days. The timeframe established in the plan ran out a long time ago and the Polish economy is far from having improved. And let us recall the fact that the economic reform in Poland is being implemented by a government that was given what one might call a 100 percent stock of trust on credit by the people. We are setting out to improve the economy in far more complex conditions.

But we have to make a start. Whether you call it a program of "100" or "1,000 days," action has to be taken. I am not going to count the days after the program has finally been implemented—obviously the transitional period will last far longer than that. But each one of us must assist in the adoption of concrete measures and their subsequent implementation to improve the economy.

[Ramazanov] A great deal is being written about the Polish market and about the efficaciousness of the "Balcerowicz plan" that we have mentioned. There are those who support it and those who are opposed to it. I would like to hear your assessment.

[Kashlev] My opinion is as follows: Soviet people should sincerely want the Polish economy to develop successfully. We can argue and propose various options but, whatever happens, we will have to take the same path. And it is not a short or a smooth path. But it is good that we can learn from someone else's experience. And we should not be embarrassed about this. Looking at Poland, we should think more about certain things—for instance, strengthening social protection for certain strata of our society during the transition to the market, coping with increasing unemployment, and dealing with the possible growth in crime in this situation. We must also attentively examine measures aimed at stabilizing the currency, restructuring internal and foreign economic ties, and, as ever, promoting initiative and enterprise.

[Ramazanov] Do certain facts, for instance the unfriendly attacks against the USSR by individual Polish citizens, not hinder our using the Polish experience?

[Kashlev] Not at all. The Polish and Soviet peoples are linked in thousands of ways. They have not lost their cordial fraternal relations. On no account must we identify with all the Polish people those who attack monuments, servicemen's graves, history, or our servicemen themselves and the very fact of their presence in the country. I am convinced of this. And there are grounds for that conviction. All the Soviet people who are in Poland performing their official duty must include among their basic tasks the task of preserving and strengthening all that was and is good between our countries.

[Ramazanov] But then how are we to assess the Polish side's note to our government, which supposedly contained demands to withdraw the Northern Group of Forces? Incidentally, the details of this note were not set out in the Soviet mass media, but that is how the Western radio broadcasts are treating it.

[Kashlev] The note did not contain any demands for the withdrawal of Soviet troops deployed on Polish territory. It was about starting talks to determine a procedure and timeframe for withdrawal. And that is all. There are no political obstacles to this step. The Soviet leadership has repeatedly declared its readiness to start such talks. It is another matter that our forces' status in Poland is different from its status, for instance, in Hungary or Czechoslovakia. Indeed, the function of the Northern Group of Forces over many years has been to provide communications in order to maintain the activity of our forces in Germany. All this must be borne in mind when preparing plans and schemes for withdrawal and establishing appropriate timeframes. But, I repeat, there are no political obstacles. This issue must be approached without haste and in a considered way. It stands to reason that there is no point in postponing talks, but people must realize that artificially charging the situation with tension and picketing military units is not helping in this matter.

[Ramazanov] Attacks on the USSR Armed Forces have recently increased, and not just in Poland. How do you explain the growth in anti-Army attitudes back in the Fatherland?

[Kashlev] I believe that this is the handiwork of a small, but well-coordinated group of people. The opinion of the Army that they have circulated through certain mass media is not the people's opinion. But it is persistently being called that. Political ambitions are behind this slandering of the Army. The weaker the army—one of the state's main institutions—the weaker the state itself. The broader the paralysis of power. And that is what some people want.

At the same time, I would like to stress that the actions of those who ask questions about reducing the Army's numerical strength, cutting military expenditure, or making the Armed Forces more clearly subordinate to the USSR Supreme Soviet must not be seen as attempts to "oppress the army." These are not attacks, but constructive proposals aimed at relieving the economic crisis in which our country finds itself.

In this case I am not talking about those who are shouting about preparations for a "military coup" and trying to present the Army as practically an oppressor of democratic processes. This is slander. It is clear that those who circulate such rumors are aiming for one thing—to smash the authorities. They are promoting the development of negative processes in society. All this is intolerable and criminal in the complex and crucial period through which our country is living.

Steep Fall in Trade With Poland Predicted

PM1110140590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric: "World in Events": "It All Adds Up to Tears..."]

[Text] Studies and forecasts confirm the same thing: Poland's level of trade turnover with CEMA countries will decline after 1 January 1991. This is the conclusion of most authors of items in the Polish press and experts, who are increasingly frequently expressing concern at the possible consequences of the transition to world prices and convertible currency in mutual transactions scheduled for the beginning of next year.

Information coming in from Polish trade missions in East European countries and the USSR gives grounds for predicting that the volume of Polish exports to these countries will decline by approximately 40 percent after the transition to the new payment format. Deliveries to the Soviet Union will fall by almost one-third. As for Polish imports from these countries, the supposition is that they will decline by more than one quarter, including a fall of approximately 15 percent in imports from the USSR.

Specialists see the reasons for this phenomenon, in particular, in the sharply reduced demand for Polish goods on these markets.

Romanian Press Coverage of KGB Criticized

90UF0575A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 90 p 3

[Article by TASS correspondent D. Dyakov: "Free-Flying 'Canards'—Romanian Journalists Have an Unusual Understanding of Freedom of the Press"]

[Text] Romanians trust the printed word. The long lines they form every morning to buy newspapers serve as an evidence of that. However, a local journalist complained to me once that their readers became choosy after the revolution: They do not completely trust their own reporters and demand more and more often that foreign authors be published. They consider them more up-to-date, more tactful, and more accurate. For that reason, my acquaintance said, when they have to persuade the reader of something they offer him "an outsider's point of view": "Look, dear compatriots, what, for instance, the French themselves think about this issue."

Honestly speaking, I did not quite believe this. But one more article reprinted from one more French publication made me wonder how correct my previous thinking was. Moreover, after I read the first installment, I started calling some journalists I knew. They worked for the newspaper LIBERTATEA, which that day gained even wider popularity. I called this paper which had published the sensational material to ask them to let me read the second part of it, even in proof form. I did not find anyone in the office and the next morning I was the first in line at the newspaper stand. About 400 people were there at 0505. Everybody wanted the same thing I did—to read the second part of the sensational story. I should think so! A crafty French journalist from L'APOSTROPHE was the first of his ilk to offer Romanian readers an exclusive, "daring version" of some world famous events that nobody could even guess about before.

According to the newspaper, a certain G. Beltachya, a former circus performer from the Moldavian city of Beltsy, served as a cook on the Soviet ship "Maksim Gorkiy," which was where the USSR and U.S. Presidents met in Malta last year. The former circus performer was more than just that, he was also a best friend of the journalist who wrote the story. And so he told the journalist what had really happened "behind the curtain" during the meeting.

At a crucial point in the meeting, the KGB agents, all wearing brown suits, could no longer withstand the combined attack of whiskey and stormy seas. As they lay on the floor the circus cook managed to get into the room where both the presidents were sitting, looking bored. The cook was not surprised or confused by this. Everybody knew about the presence of the two presidents on board. However, he was stunned at the sight of an unexpected visitor in the cabin—Iraqi President Saddam Husayn.

After a couple of days, as I was looking for another issue of LIBERTATEA, I accidentally ran into that same journalist. Consumed with curiosity, I asked him to tell me how that story ended.

"You see," he told me in a conspiratorial manner, "we have run out of imagination. And another thing—those conscientious French decided to sue us. They claim we have disgraced them. What disgrace are they talking about?" He was fuming and then he revealed to me another secret. It emerged that the French journalist did not exist and neither did the French newspaper of that name. The whole story was invented and put together by the regular LIBERTATEA staff. "What for?" "To entertain our readers," answered the inventors' colleague simply, without a trace of embarrassment.

I have to admit that it became much more interesting to read the newspapers after the revolution, after the journalists were freed at last from censorship. They started to describe their country's problems in a bold and vivid manner. Together with their readers they are fighting to establish democracy in Romania. However, one subject has been constantly present on the pages of nearly every publication since the first post-revolutionary weeks. It is especially obvious in the opposition, "independent", and "the most independent" periodicals and it can be defined in three words—the "hand of Moscow."

Here, for instance, is a statement by one the people writing for the BARICADA weekly. Quite seriously, he writes about "a large-scale act of radioelectronic sabotage" which was started in Romania on 19 December, by "specialized military units of the USSR and the KGB." More than that: It is not only that "KGB agents disguised as TASS correspondents" were teeming in Timisoara during the December events, but they also "poisoned the international press with their false information" (even though none of us—TASS correspondents—managed to be there, unfortunately).

If his first statement is just as sincere as the second I can assure you that he is lying through his teeth. And I doubt that he had read a single piece of information sent by TASS correspondents from Bucharest in those days.

Ceausescu used to frighten his people by stories of "foreign agents" acting in Timisoara. But a few months later, during the trials in that city, two former chiefs of the Romanian counter intelligence, Generals Macri and Teodorescu said clearly and firmly that there had not been a trace of foreign intelligence activity in Timisoara. The people stood up because they were victimized by dictatorship. The claims of the agonizing dictator can be explained, in a way. But how do we explain the fact that numerous articles about the "KGB role" started appearing right after the January events in Bucharest's Victoria Square? Did the KGB wish to overthrow the new Romanian Government also? And why the KGB and no others, I wonder?

Some Romanian journalists answer our bewildered questions with, "Do not pay any attention to it, it is not serious; it is done just 'to compete for the readers' attention'." But is it not insulting to the hundreds of thousands of people who risked their life fighting against the dictatorship?

And another thing: Some of these materials are signed by serious authors who enjoy the public trust. Declarations that "from every point of view, the USSR remains a country which we cannot rely on" (ZIGZAG) or that Gorbachev's main goal is "to save communism and the Soviet empire" and countries like Romania could become nothing but "a test ground to try out perestroyka principles" (DREPTATEA) can hardly be considered objective.

It was quite recently that Romanian journalists practically had to go underground to learn about the processes going on in the USSR as they dreamed about the day when their country would free itself from dictatorship. But now they are actively involved in the "fight against Moscow's communist influence," which allegedly prevents Romanian society from "being included in Europe."

"Fear of Moscow" seems to be profitable for purposes other than competing for readers' attention. It is used by those who do not like the present leadership of the country as a part of their political intrigue. Having exhausted their imagination some periodicals have started "kidding" and to seem important they kid with references "to Europe." But I think that the "old world" has already figured out what the "fighters against neo-communism" are worth. Should they continue trying so hard?

West Europe

Gorbachev Advisor Views German Unification

AU0810175190 Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 4 Oct 90 p 8

[Interview with Marshal Sergey Fedorovich Akhromeyev, adviser to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, by Klaus Joachim Herrmann in the Kremlin in Moscow on 2 October: "Germany, the New Europe, and Perestroyka"]

[Text] [Herrmann] Marshal, do you view German unification with joy or with concern—considering also your experience as general chief of staff?

[Akhromeyev] You see, I would say that I have mixed feelings. First, I realized 10 or 12 years ago that the division of Germany could not last forever. There is one people—the Germans—and sooner or later, they were bound to unite. Basically, their division was unnatural. Second, I also realized that Soviet troops could not stay abroad for ever. There is no other example in history of forces being deployed abroad almost half a century after the end of a war. Therefore, I think that the unification of the two German states is nothing but natural, and this all the more so since it came largely about owing to the Soviet Union's new foreign policy, and owing to the new Soviet military doctrine which was drafted in mid-1987.

However, I am a man of my epoch. I have seen a lot in my life, the most important event being the Great Patriotic War. It may sound paradoxical that the most important things in a man's life happened between his 18th and 22nd years of life, and now this man is 68. At the time, he was a soldier, a sergeant and a noncommissioned officer, and now he is a marshal of the Soviet Union. Nonetheless, this war remains the most important thing in the life of my country and my people. Our task was to defend our home country against destruction. Therefore, I am somehow worried—where is united Germany going? This feeling remains. All guarantees have apparently been given. The treaties are signed, I personally trust the Germans who have changed. I trust the state leaders who signed these treaties. However, people naturally have doubts, and, frankly speaking, as far as I am concerned, these doubts have not been dispelled.

[Herrmann] The GDR will disappear from the map, a Federal Republic of Germany, enlarged by five laender, will be created. Does that constitute a victory of political interests over military interests? At least, this represents also a loss of terrain which is not insignificant....

[Akhromeyev] The answer to this question is essentially contained in your first statement. What could be added? The situation in Europe has thoroughly changed. The confrontation and the conflict between two alliances—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—have disappeared. Not entirely, because there are still problems. Nonetheless, security is being defined in a different way both in Europe and in the Soviet Union. Therefore, I do not think that the enlargement of the FRG by five laender, the considerable increase of its population to 80 million, and the logical strengthening of the economic potential of the FRG's economic might represent a great danger to our country, all the less so since the FRG and the USSR not only seek to generally normalize their relations but also to put them on a friendly basis. So I am worried and hopeful that the development will advance in a productive way.

[Herrmann] Is it true that objections to this course were above all voiced by military officials, and what was the reason for these objections?

[Akhromeyev] The course was prepared step by step. The people lie who claim that it was already clear how things would continue in March 1985 when Gorbachev took power. The course was gradually drafted by the political leadership together with the military leadership.

Of course—and this is a very personal remark—this new course was not so easy. It was not easy at all, but was the result of great worries and a major internal restructuring which had been started several months earlier. We are military officers, and as such we were used to seeing the Warsaw Pact and our forces on the territory of the GDR, the CSSR, Poland, and Hungary as the basis of the Soviet Union's security. The entire security system that was created following the war, was to us, the military officers, the foundation on which everything else was based. Was it painless for us not only to destroy the not only building but also the foundation, and to create a new security system? Of course, it was a very painful and difficult path for us. Nonetheless, now that all this happened, I am convinced that the decisions were right and have been carried out without major convulsions. Convulsions there were, of course, but there was no war, and no new danger was created in Europe. Having made a thorough analysis, the military and the politicians now support our leadership.

[Herrmann] How do you view the acceptance of a united Germany within NATO?

[Akhromeyev] Personally I think that under the new conditions in Europe, NATO has no right to exist. There is no basis. Who is now threatening the West European countries? No one. Why is a military organization such as NATO required? There is no reasonable answer to this question. Life will settle that. I do not know why Germany needs to have NATO. The Germans should think about it carefully. After having completed their unification, and having got used to the new state of affairs, they will see for themselves what they should, or should not, take over from the past.

[Herrmann] Are the provisions in the two-plus-four agreement and the bilateral treaty between the USSR and the Federal Republic, including their military policy components, such as the upper ceiling for the German Army, not reassuring?

[Akhromeyev] Yes. I think it was very difficult to regulate the external aspects of the German problem. It was not just a political but also a national problem for the Soviet Union and the Soviet people. Our leadership, Mikhail Gorbachev, succeeded with the good will of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and the other leading German politicians in reaching these agreements. That shows the great responsibility and realism on the German side. I do not think this was the last agreement we signed. We will conclude additional agreements in the next few months. Of course, limiting the strength of the Bundeswehr is of great importance, and no less important is the definite settlement of the borders in Europe. All that is the foundation on which Europe's security and our relations will be based. This includes also the obligation assumed by Germany regarding nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons.

[Herrmann] The Soviet troop withdrawal from Eastern Europe will create new problems at a difficult time. Can they be resolved at all in the foreseeable future?

[Akhromeyev] We are living in a difficult time; that also holds true for the Soviet Armed Forces. It will take several years to resolve these problems satisfactorily. Repatriating the Armed Forces also means the return of about 100,000 officers and officer cadets. The main problem is housing. I think that our troops from the former GDR will be repatriated within four or five years, and we will basically solve this problem. However, currently it is difficult for the officers and their families.

[Herrmann] We hear often enough—even here in the Soviet Union—that the GDR as a former strategic ally was released into NATO at too cheap a price.

[Akhromeyev] To begin with, I do not agree to the way you formulate this question. What do you mean by released? How could we have kept the Germans if they wanted to achieve unity, and we started to restructure our policy? I think that as of 1987, the GDR determined itself what form of government and what social system it wanted to have, and what its relations with the FRG should be. I think not only the GDR leadership but all Germans—the people—sensed that. As a result, the development went in the direction of unification. The Soviet Union did not interfere with this development. It believed that this was an affair of the Germans themselves. Therefore, it is not correct to speak about the GDR "having been released at a cheap price." You can talk like that about your property. However, we communists never believed that another country or another nation were our property. It is wrong to claim such a thing. We cultivated our relations with the German people, the German Democratic Republic, on the basis of comradely help and friendship. I do not think that these 45 years were in vain.

[Herrmann] However, sometimes the Soviet side exerted pressure....

[Akhromeyev] Yes, of course. That is not surprising. Our relations were like that. We all thought—all of us, not only we but you too—that we must help each other at difficult times. When the pressure of the West on the GDR increased, and when there were internal problems and difficulties, we helped in accordance with our former common ideology.

[Herrmann] You mean the events in 1953....

[Akhromeyev] Well, not just that year. I also mean 1961 when the wall was built. There may also have been other events. We thought at that time that it was right. And only when we analyzed this long period, these 40 years, did we ask ourselves whether it should last forever. We asked ourselves: Should this tutelage be continued indefinitely—this tutelage of the Soviet Union over the GDR and other countries? The people finally realized that the relations between the countries were deteriorating. That was one of the reasons we revised our foreign policy. By the way, the Soviet Union has not derived any advantage from this; on the contrary. Trade with the GDR was balanced ruble by ruble. We always had to help the other countries at all times—not only in the military area but also in the economic and other areas. That was quite a heavy burden on the shoulders of the Soviet Union.

[Herrmann] The military-strategic balance that we tried to achieve for a long time has changed since perestroyka. How does the USSR military leadership meet the new conditions; will there be a new strategy?

[Akhromeyev] Yes, of course. There are new conditions because the USSR's line of defense was shifted 600 or 800 kilometers further to the east, to our borders. Because the Armed Forces will return to their territory, it will be necessary to draft a new military doctrine and a new military strategy. In practice, we have already begun to work at it. It may take one or two years to decide on these problems because there are no easy problems.

[Herrmann] Could you say something about the direction of this work?

[Akhromeyev] The main principle of our military strategy remains what it is today. Defense, the principle of reasonable sufficiency, the dependence of the quality and quantity of the armed forces on the military situation. The Soviet Union will no longer have to take into account the situation throughout the world. Its sphere of responsibility and interest has decreased. The principles continue to apply that we will not be the first to start war, that we will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, and that we will not make any territorial claims. We are ready to live in peace and friendship with everyone. While the political principles remain, the military-technological ones are changing. The troops will be deployed differently. They will be given different tasks. There will only be changes in this respect.

[Herrmann] Marshal, following the developments last year, does the Warsaw Pact still have a chance to be reorganized as a political alliance for—to put it plainly—lack of members?

[Akhromeyev] I think that the Warsaw Pact as a military organization will end its activities in the near future—in the very near future, probably as soon as 1991. The political aspect will then depend on the countries themselves. I think a major number of countries have an interest in seeing the Warsaw Pact continue as a political organization. I do not think the Soviet Union will be opposed to any decision that its allies make.

[Herrmann] Despite the negative experiences of the past, could you conceive of another attempt by the USSR to become a member of NATO?

[Akhromeyev] We have had no direct interest in membership within NATO. We brought up this matter as a theoretical possibility, and we saw NATO's reaction. Now, by the end of this year, Comrade Gorbachev will appear in Brussels. He will probably also say something on this topic. I do not think it is a great wish of the Soviet Union to become a member of NATO.

[Herrmann] You will understand that many people in my country are watching the current crisis of perestroyka with concern. Permit me therefore to ask you about the role of the Armed Forces. Would you rule out the possibility that a state of emergency will be imposed, or that the Army will seize power?

[Akhromeyev] Imposing a state of emergency is the president's business, it is the business of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In this case, the Army fulfills the decisions made by the Supreme Soviet and the decrees enacted by the president. If the situation suddenly deteriorates in a way that a relevant decision is made, we will carry it out.

Regarding the speculation about a military putsch, I am sick of discussing it. For five years, I have always said the same thing: Such a putsch is totally impossible in the Soviet Union. It has not been discussed by people who are really concerned that it may come. It has been discussed by those who do not like the structure of our socialist society, and who pursue their own political interests that are aimed against the state leadership and the CPSU. They have invented the possibility of a military putsch. It is practically impossible in our Soviet Union.

[Herrmann] Why?

[Akhromeyev] Because the highest command level and all officers are trained in a way that they respect the higher power organs, the government, and never act against the constitutional order. Do you know of any such attempt in the Soviet Union's 73-year history? Has there ever been any such attempt? No.

[Herrmann] How about the recent events on which the press reported, and which were also discussed in the Supreme Soviet?

[Akhromeyev] There were no such events. There were rumors. These rumors were spread by certain forces. However, there were no such events. It all is not true.

[Herrmann] Where do you see the West's interests? In the consolidation or in the weakening of the Soviet Union?

[Akhromeyev] We cannot view the West as something homogeneous. The various countries have different interests, even though these interests are not basically different. I would like to deal with the U.S. position. The

U.S. policy toward the USSR is contradictory. The United States wants to cooperate with us in many areas. Our relations have improved. As a result, the military tensions have decreased. That has led to the changes in Europe during the past two years. We concluded our work on important agreements with the United States on a reduction in nuclear weapons.

However, at the same time, the United States has not changed its policy in every respect. In some areas, the policy of strength is being continued. Why does the military organization of NATO continue to exist? It surely continues to exist at the request of the United States, and not primarily at the request of the European countries. The United States does not hold negotiations with us on the reduction of the Navy, even though we repeatedly suggested holding such talks. They want to have superiority in this respect. Or, the United States backs Japan's territorial claims toward the Soviet Union. These examples show that much work remains to be done to totally normalize our relations.

[Herrmann] Do you view the future role of the West, and in particular that of the united Germany, rather positively?

[Akhromeyev] On the whole, the relations of the West with perestroyka are positive. However, some problems related to our mutual economic relations could be resolved faster. It is the United States' fault as well as ours, because the market relations in our country are not functioning, and because it is difficult to solve the economic problems.

Regarding Germany, there are experiences, and there is that system of economic relations which existed between the GDR and the USSR. I do not think it will be totally destroyed. That will also help us to develop economic cooperation with Germany on a large scale and within a short time.

[Herrmann] What wishes would you like to convey to the Germans?

[Akhromeyev] I said earlier that I am a man of this epoch. The Great Patriotic War has made an indelible impression on me—the war between the Soviet Union and fascist Germany. However, that is not the only aspect. Being a thinking man who knows our country's history, I am also aware that cooperation with Germany has considerably benefited our country. Our change toward Europe began with Peter I. Many Germans worked in Russia. They helped build the first academy of sciences, and they helped build our schools and our industry. There were also quite a few Germans in the Army. This development continued.

Thus there are not only bad but also good memories of Germany. Therefore, we are optimistic that our relations will improve, and confidence will deepen.

Calls for 'Boycott' of Troops in Germany Noted

PM1110143390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric: "World in Events": "Soldiers Out of Fashion"]

[Text] The population of the districts of Luckenwalde, Jueterbog, and Zossen and Brandenburg Land civic movements have called for a trade boycott and other actions against the Western Group of Forces.

This is reported by the newspaper MAERKISCHE ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG. The reason for the appeal, the newspaper asserts, is the firing carried out on military training ranges, which has become more intensive since 3 October.

Local residents, the newspaper writes, want a final precise answer as to which Soviet troop units will be withdrawn from here and when, who will pay for and carry out the rehabilitation of land taken out of cultivation, and what real opportunities exist for reducing the noise from aircraft flights and training firing?

The civic movements are also resolutely objecting to the deployment of Bundeswehr or NATO troop contingents here after the Soviet soldiers return home, the report stresses.

Joint German Nuclear Power Cooperation Planned

LD1110203390 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Sergey Ryabinkin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Cooperation between the Soviet Union and united Germany in nuclear power engineering is moving to a new, higher stage. This conclusion was made by participants in the talks, held today by delegations from the two countries, led by Soviet nuclear power engineering minister Vitaliy Konovalov and Klaus Toepfer, German minister for environment, the protection of nature and the safety of nuclear reactors.

They discussed the role played by nuclear power engineering, the construction of nuclear power plants and the improvement of their safety. Agreement was reached on the creation of several working groups of experts, who will soon take up the development of nuclear reactors of a new generation, the rebuilding, modernisation and exploitation of power units and the improvement of safety of the functioning reactors.

Konovalov told TASS that the nuclear power plants, built earlier, should be transformed to meet today's safety requirements. He expressed hope that the recent measures would prevent a catastrophe, similar to the Chernobyl accident, and even "mistakes of the personnel".

Toepfer told TASS that they had discussed at the talks the problem of dumping radioactive waste. Although a final agreement was not reached on this subject, "an important step forward was made".

Touching upon the production of uranium on territory of the former GDR, Toepfel stressed the need for close technological cooperation with the USSR in this sphere.

Gorbachev Greets Soviet Greek Festival

PM0910144790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Message from M. Gorbachev to Soviet Greeks' Festival: "To the All-Union Greek Culture and Art Festival"]

[Text] Dear fellow countrymen and guests from Greece and Cyprus!

I greet your remarkable venture. I have no doubt that the festival will be an event in cultural life.

More than one generation of people in our country has been raised on the spiritual values of the ancient Greeks. With the adoption of Christianity, Byzantine culture influenced our peoples' life for many centuries. Greeks who had lived in Russia for a long time were among the front ranks of fighters for the liberation of Greece from foreign oppression. Many Greek names will remain in our common history forever.

The Greeks in the USSR shared with our other peoples both the revolutionary fervor of the October era and the grief of losses and unrealized hopes. They endured in full the heavy blows of the Stalin era.

Perestroyka has exposed the fact that many national problems, including those that are specifically Greek, have not been resolved. We shall tackle them together and, I am sure, achieve our goals. It is very important to realize now that the sociopolitical questions connected with national relations cannot be resolved without a revival of spirituality, a general development of culture, and cultural cooperation among our peoples.

In the light of that I wish full success to your festival, which is being held with such an impressive participation by Greeks from abroad. I hope, too, that it will serve to strengthen the good relations between the USSR and Greece, Cyprus, and the entire Greek diaspora.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Presidential Council Member Arrives in Cyprus

LD1010052290 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 9 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Mashkov]

[Excerpts] Nicosia October 9 TASS—An international cultural mission called "sources" consisting of politicians, clergymen, scientists, cultural figures and mass media representatives arrived in the Cypriot port of Larnaca. [pasage omitted]

The mission's aim is to revive humane traditions and spiritual culture which would help bring the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries closer together.

The mission's delegation which included member of the Soviet Presidential Council Veniamin Yarin, was received by Larnaca Mayor. G. Christodoulidis today. The sides had a conversation which revealed friendly relations between the Soviet and Cypriot peoples. [passage omitted]

CPSU Secretary Attends Cyprus Congress

PM0910153490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by special correspondents V. Drobkov and V. Potapov: "Solidarity in Struggle. At the 17th AKEL Congress"]

[Text] Nicosia, 5 Oct—The delegates to the Cypriot communists' congress are discussing the report delivered by D. Khristofias, general secretary of the AKEL [Restorative Party of the Working People] Central Committee. There is a frank and principled discussion of the party's position on acute problems of the present day and the search for ways to renew its theoretical and practical activity. Speaking about the prospects for resolving the Cyprus crisis, many delegates point to the importance of internationalizing the problem and involving the widest possible international forces in resolving it.

The assembled people warmly greeted the speech by V.A. Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the CPSU delegation.

We know of the great and truly friendly interest with which you communists follow everything that is happening in our country, the Soviet Union, and in the CPSU, he said. We know that this interest is mixed with anxiety. We really are living through a difficult time now. The point that we have reached in implementing perestroyka may with good reason be called a turning point. The democratization of political life must be followed by the democratization of economic life, the speaker continued. And this means organizing the economy on market principles, transforming ownership relations, and abandoning the total nationalization of the economy. Perestroyka in the Soviet Union, inseparably linked with the policy founded on the new thinking in international affairs, has done much to contribute to the favorable changes in the world.

In the present complex and rapidly changing situation, V.A. Kuptsov pointed out, special significance attaches to relations between the CPSU and AKEL. The indissoluble ties and immutable fraternal solidarity between Soviet and Cypriot communists are being filled with specific new substance and meaning under the internal and external conditions now taking shape for each of our countries. Our party and Soviet communists confirm their support for the just struggle which AKEL is waging for the working people's social and economic rights in the interests of the entire Cypriot people. The CPSU is grateful for the support for our perestroyka and our desire to transform our society and country.

The 17th AKEL Congress is continuing its work.

Azerbaijan, Turkey Sign Cooperation Agreements

LD0810213290 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 27 Sep 90

[AZERINFORM report]

[Excerpts] A government delegation from Azerbiajan led by G.A.Gasnanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] council of Ministers, made an official visit to Turkey from 14 to 19 September. [passage omitted]

The delegation was received by Turkish President Turgut Ozal on 19 September. During a conversation which took place in an atmosphere of good will, sincerity, and complete mutual understanding, there was a detailed exchange of opinions on the state of Turkish-Azerbaijani relations and the situation in the region. [passage omitted] The implementation of a long-term program for supplying natural gas via Azerbaijan to western Anatoliya and also using it to produce fertilizers was discussed. [passage omitted] There was a meeting with Prime Minister Yildirim Akbulut on the same day at which practical steps to implement economic cooperation programs between our countries were discussed, in particular the construction of a plant to produce audio and video cassettes in Azerbaijan and further expanding cross-border trade involving more Turkish firms and enterprises in trade. [passage omitted]

Talks, meetings, and conference examined developing Turkish-Azerbaijani relations in light of the 10 January 1990 protocols "On Developing Economic and Trade Ties Between the Azerbaijan SSR and the Turkish Republic" and "On Cultural and Scientific Exchange Between the Azerbaijan SSR and the Turkish Republic from 1990 to 1992." [passage omitted]

The signing of contracts between Turkish firms and Azerbaijani organizations for the construction of enterprises for the joint processing of furs and leather and clothing, production, the manufacture of aluminum pipes and aluminum goods, as well as accords on cooperation in producing chemical goods, modern digital communciations equipment, fitting enterprises with equipment for dressing leather, and producing sanitation and ceramic ware using marble chips and other materials, were greeted with satisfaction.

An accord was reached on the reciprocal exchange of electric power. Opportunities were examined for exporting electromechanical equipment—transfomers, cables, circuit breakers, switches, and more—produced in Turkey to Azerbaijan and producing it jointly. There was unity of views on cooperation to improve the efficiency of thermal power stations in Azerbaijan and to build hydro-electric power stations on minor rivers in the republic as well as to improve existing power stations.

The Turkish side expressed an interest in joint cooperation in seeking and extracting oil in Azerbaijan and improving oil drilling enterprises as well as in seeking and extracting ore. [passage omitted]

In view of the prospects which are opening up in the field of tourism as a result of the organization of a border checkpoint in Nakhichevan, it was decided to encourage organized tours, establish bilateral airline flights, and develop cooperation by setting up joint tourism projects. [passage omitted]

As a result of the visit by the Azerbaijan SSR delegation, several joint documents were signed. [passage omitted] The USSR Government authorized G.A. Gasanov to sign an intergovernmental agreement on sharing equally the joint building of a road and rail bridge over the Araks River near the towns of Sadarak in Nakhichevan and Aralik-Diludzhu in Turkey. The document envisages opening a border crossing between the USSR and Turkey for bilateral road and rail communications when the construction of the bridge has been completed.

Several bilateral agreements between the Azerbaijan SSR and the Turkish republic were also signed. An agreement on cooperation in the field of communications and television envisages installing 60 telephone lines—30 in each direction—between the Azerbaijan SSR and the Turkish Republic, ensuring that both sides have access to telephone links with third countries using these lines, and setting a mutually advantageous charge for this service. Installation of a 1,800-line communications system between Sadarak radio relay station and Igdir radio broadcasting station is envisaged.

An agreement was signed on inaugurating scheduled and unscheduled Baku-Istanbul-Baku flights.

An agreement was signed in the area of maritime trade and shipping in order to promote the development of trade and economic relations between the two countries.

The chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers and the minister of finance and customs of the Turkish Republic signed a protocol on developing cross border trade between our countries. In accordance with this protocol, goods will be supplied on the basis of contracts concluded between the relevant organizations in the Azerbaijan SSR and Turkish republic and private organizations, firms, and traders. There will be a balance in cross border trade. Transactions will be in hard currency or barter trade.

On a proposal from the Azerbaijan SSR delegation, it was decided to set up an intergovernmental commission for trade and economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation to be in charge of the practical implementation of the above agreements between Azerbaijan and Turkey.

One of the most important results of the official talks was an accord on opening a general consulate of the Turkish Republic in Baku. This will significantly ease the resolution of many issues of economic and cultural cooperation.

On behalf of A.N. Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan SSR, and the government of the republic, G.A. Gasanov invited Turgut Ozal, Prime Minister Yildirim Akbulut, and Minister of Finance and Customs Adnan Kahveci to visit Azerbaijan. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Latin America & Caribbean

Army General Moiseyev Comments on Visit to Cuba

LD1110202390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Interview with M.A. Moiseyev, army general and chief of general staff of the Armed Forces, following Moiseyev's visit to Cuba, by correspondent Ye. Fateyev, date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The official visit to Cuba by a Soviet military delegation has ended.

[Ye. Fateyev] The Cubans' powerful weaponry, as is known, is mainly Soviet-made. They also owe their combat proficiency in no small measure to 30 years of military cooperation with our country. It is perfectly natural that the Soviet delegation led by Army General Moiseyev was met in Cuba as brothers-in-arms.

That is the tradition here, but it must be said, nevertheless, that interest in this visit was heightened. This is because a number of extraordinary measures in the so-called special period in peacetime—connected, as announced, with the reduction in the supplies of food, fuel, and raw materials to here from the USSR—were introduced in Cuba a few days ago. Besides this, Gen. Moiseyev and the persons accompanying him arrived in Havana after a successful official visit to the United States.

[M.A. Moiseyev] You must not view my visit to the United States as being in contrast to the visit to Cuba. Both visits had purely business contacts. [sentence as heard] We are today giving Cuba economic and military assistance within the framework of the accords adopted and signed previously by our leadership.

Komplektov Receives Cuban Ambassador

PM1110093790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 8 October V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received J.R. Balaguer, Cuban ambassador to the USSR.

During the talk there was a discussion of specific issues of Soviet-Cuban relations.

History of Relations With Cuba Discussed

91UF0010A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by K. Khachaturov, doctor of historical sciences: "Understand and Give Them Their Due"]

[Text] **Cuba: stereotypes and specifics. A reform of bilateral ties is needed.**

A quarter of a century ago we Soviet citizens, when visiting the exhibition hall in Havana, were literally blinded by the bright colors of the canvases: the phantasmagoria of the abstractionists, the dry geometry of the cubists, the childlike naivete of the primitivists. But by the very fact of our visit to the private showing it was as though we had participated in some disgraceful act.

The exhibition stunned us and... insulted us with its utter ingratitude. Was this any way to repay us for our generous and selfless aid! The Caribbean crisis, which had placed mankind on the verge of a nuclear catastrophe had just been resolved. True, it was on our initiative that the Cubans had received the missiles, with their Soviet attendants, which were aimed at the United States. But still, what tactlessness! We had just been denouncing our homegrown abstractionists in Moscow's Manezh exhibition hall. Nikita Sergeyevich had never before been in such a state of righteous anger. His successor replaced his choice epithets with the blade of a bulldozer.

Our wrath can only be called one thing: intolerance. "Little brother" had dared to break the rules of the game: "Do what I do but do not do it better than I."

The eternal intolerance that runs throughout our domestic history even today reflects the stereotype of our attitude toward the processes taking place in Cuba. The economics, politics, and ideology of this country correspond to our ideas of socialism of five years ago. This stagnation and our lack of desire or inability to respond to the summons of time are disturbing many of our commentators, including those elected by the people. But our intolerance of different ways of thinking and acting is based on at least three false premises.

We may begin with the fact that for many decades we anathematized attempts at the slightest modification by the "fraternal countries" of the administrative system we created. The guardians of a unified iron discipline in all areas—from agriculture to preschool education—was our army of all-knowing advisers who operated thoughtlessly from the Caribbean Sea to the Gobi desert.

So if we have entered on the path of perestroyka after long suffering, why should the peoples of all other countries recover their sight at the same time? Such exported "vision" is worse than out-and-out evil. Incidentally, the Cuban leadership have repeatedly undertaken experiments which our advisers, with their typical rigor, have deemed to be heresy.

One must not fail to take into account the specific nature of Cuba's historical development, which is as different from ours as the royal palm is from the Siberian cedar. From the very beginning the textbook Leninist tenet concerning the diversity of ways of changing to socialism was distorted by the recognition of the unity of the goal and the lack of consideration of the uniqueness of each true socialist movement.

Finally, this question arises: Does the shadow of the processes in East Europe not hang over the Island of Freedom?

No, it does not. In the countries of East Europe Communist Parties became the ruling parties because of the victory of the Soviet Union in World War II. In other words, first there appeared the soldier-liberator and after that, the local government structures.

The situation developed differently in Cuba. The revolution first triumphed as a national liberation and anti-imperialist revolution and only later did it grow into a socialist revolution with a clear predominance of the subjective over the objective factor, although nobody is capable of measuring "reasonable" proportions. The lush crown of the Cuban tree of life is nourished by deep natural roots.

The hard-headed policy of U.S. leaders contributed to Cuba's forced, fast-paced shift to the path of socialist construction. In Cuba, as in no other country which has taken the socialist option, national self-awareness has historically been traumatized by another country's policy, which degraded the elementary national and human dignity. In keeping with the "division of labor," with the monoculture imposed by the United States (to some a coffee or banana plantation, to others a pasture, an oil field, or a mine) Cuba was prepared for the role of bordello to service the nearby tourist area.

It is impossible to ignore the reaction to the many years of stagnation of the entire nation. Anti-Americanism in Cuba has a certain persistence. And this anti-Americanism—which is essentially fatal, just as any xenophobia is fatal—became goal-oriented at the level of state policy when the White House responded to the victory of the Cuban Revolution and its initial reforms not with a strict economic blockade of the socialist type but with other forms of undeclared war.

The battle between the David and Goliath, the most powerful capitalist power and the small island state that had been dependent on it for absolutely everything could not but arouse sympathies for Cuba everywhere. And here was the global Soviet-American tug-of-war and the confrontation that had grown along all the lines of the two social systems, in which each side when counting up its points celebrated the acquisition of a new ally. Especially one that was located only 90 miles from the United States. Could we really, in an irrational mistake of those years, not make use of such an advantageous geopolitical situation? Thus, on our own initiative, Cuba was given large-scale political and economic and also military support with all the obligations that entailed for us, and actually for an unlimited period of time.

A fundamental question: Is our political ally in the Caribbean Sea a socialist country or does it only claim to be one with the help of incantations? Obviously, the answer is determined by the initial socioeconomic and spiritual condition of the postrevolutionary society, the limit on the possibilities of its development, and our notion of the ideal. It is one thing if one speculates, say, that the Swedish model is the standard. It is another thing when there are no alternatives to the situation and Cuba can be compared to the backward countries of the Caribbean basin or Central America, with their largely similar distorted socioeconomic system. In this case Cuba is a socialist country if the main criterion is considered to be the achievement of social justice or at least a collective striving for this ideal.

The author of these lines has a right to claim a professional knowledge of the nature of the modern processes in Latin America. And although in our country, in a society of extremes, the subject of socialist contrasts abroad is no longer fashionable, one can assert without fear of being mistaken: The position of the majority of the population of the Caribbean and Central American countries is catastrophic. Their lot includes unemployment, illiteracy, premature aging and a high death rate, chronic malnutrition, and separation from all the benefits of civilization. This merciless sentence was given to this society by its tragic childhood misfortune. In contrast to all these bad things one can speak about the uniqueness of the Cuban society.

In Cuba you do not find homeless, poor, illiterate, or unemployed people. Here is just one indicator: The life span in Cuba is increasing more rapidly than in any other country. The Cuban has a high level of social security, which cannot be said of any other country in the Third World. At the same time I am far from idealizing Cuban reality with its multitude of problems, including the ration card system, its shortage of consumer goods, and the waiting lines in stores which are so familiar to us.

With all the obvious achievements of the social experiment, Cuba has ended up a society with largely unrealized possibilities. In my view, for three main reasons: the hostile policy of the United States and the economic blockade that accompanied it, its own mistakes, and the costs of integration with our administrative system. And the truth can still be seen in comparison. Therefore, it is correct to speak about the attractive force of the Cuban phenomenon for many peoples of the Third World.

Cuba considers itself a country which is simultaneously Latin American, developing, nonaligned, and socialist. The Cubans use this unrepeatable combination to explain the peculiarity of their political system. It is no secret, however, that there is criticism abroad of the single-party structure of the Cuban society and the fact that its leader does not change. But before judging others, let us remember ourselves in the recent past when the country in chorus wished a long life to "dear Leonid Ilich." And yet compared to him Fidel Castro is an intellectual and moral giant, and he did not come to power through palace intrigues.

The Cuban leader has one of the longest tenures as a state leader. As such he is distinguished by his intelligence, human decency, sincerity, lack of pretension, and accessibility. The Cubans are on familiar terms with him and call him simply Fidel. And this is not an example of the familiarity of the exalted crowd but, as a rule, deep respect. Let me note one peculiarity of no small significance: Cuba is the only socialist country that has avoided mass repressions and political trials.

The advice to the Cubans about how they should restructure their society that can be found on the pages of a number of our publications sounds tactless. How sensitive are we and our peoples to mutual advice when we unwaveringly regard it as an inadmissible intrusion into the forbidden sovereign zone of the Union and autonomous republics? But why do we refuse the people of the country across the ocean the right to be equally sensitive? The right to choose their own path of development?

There is no doubt that our entire complex of foreign economic ties, an important constituent part of which is cooperation with Cuba, is in need of radical reform. We are talking about cooperation and not philanthropy. During a recent trip to Havana I became convinced not only of the country's concern for the fate of its traditional economic ties but also of its readiness to look for new approaches to mutually advantageous cooperation based on equal rights.

Modern Cuba is capable of offering not only sugar and oranges, rum and cigars, but also biotechnology, computer equipment, high-quality pharmaceuticals, and, of course, year-round recreation on its incomparable beaches. Incidentally, more than a thousand Soviet children who were victims of Chernobyl are now healing and convalescing there. In today's frenzied but by no means beautiful world one cannot but cherish such feelings on the part of a people which has been and is our true friend and wishes to be in the future.

Four Sailors Seek Asylum in Panama 11 Oct

LD1210061790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0548 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] Panama, 12 Oct (TASS)—On Thursday [11 October] morning, a Panama Coast Guard patrol boat found a life raft with four Soviet sailors on board, not far from the city's municipal beach.

They are a navigator, motor mechanic, and two students at a naval academy from the Latrybprom [Latvian fishing industry] Bereg Baltiki fishing ship, which was to pass through the Panama Canal.

As it turned out, during the night they left the ship to seek asylum from the Panamanian authorities. The reasons why the four sailors decided on such a step are unclear, although judging from their initial statements they do not have any political aims.

Supreme Soviet

Parties Invited To Discuss Union Treaty

LD1110161590 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—Although most of the numerous political parties that emerged recently in the Soviet Union are not represented in the Soviet Parliament, they are given an opportunity to take part in the law-making process.

Representatives of some 20 new political parties and movements were invited to the Parliament today to discuss a draft concept of the new Union treaty.

The meeting, the second one of its kind, "is neither a tactical move, nor a game," deputy head of the Council of Nationalities Boris Oleinik, who chaired the meeting, told TASS. He said that concluding the treaty "without due consideration of the opinion of new political parties and public movements, even if plenipotentiary representatives of the Union Republics sign it, will not bring consensus and the reconciliation of nations".

Grigoriy Atamanchuk, expert from the Department for Inter-Ethnic Relations of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said that after the first meeting in September representatives of the parties had prepared their own version of the draft treaty. So far, they only agree on one item—all agree that Union relations should be based, above all, on the observance of human rights and the equality of all nations. The future setup of the country—a federation or a confederation—is the subject of especially heated discussions.

Janis Bremzis, representative of the Russian People's Democratic Front "Pamyat", a section of the notorious patriotic society of the same name, said that "at present the Soviet Union is moving towards disintegration and possible civil wars between separate republics. Perhaps, even nuclear weapons will be used. Naturally, the republics will claim them when dividing the All-Union potential between themselves." Bremzis strongly opposed the transformation of the Soviet Union into a confederation of states and suggested creating a "union of sovereign and democratic republics".

Sergey Skripnikov, a representative of the Democratic Union, did not agree with Bremzis. He said that "the disintegration of the last colonial empire" is actually taking place and that "the least painful way out of the existing situation is the creation of a confederation of independent states on Soviet territory," which could fulfil common tasks.

Of course, it is impossible to find in two hours the answer to the question, what kind of a country the new Union will be? The Parliamentary Council of Nationalities intends to continue meeting with new political parties and public organisations in order to work out a concept for the new draft treaty.

Committees, Commissions Discuss Draft Laws 12 Oct

LD1210084390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 700 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work today. As is usual on Fridays, deputies are working in committees and commissions. Draft laws which will constitute the legal basis for the transition to market conditions are the main topic under discussion. Thus, the Commission for Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Oblasts, and Okrugs of the Soviet of Nationalities is planning to analyze in detail a draft law on foreign investments. The commission for women's affairs will hear reports on the course of preparations for the parliamentary hearing dedicated to the implementation in the USSR of provisions of the UN convention on the abolition of discrimination against women. Draft laws on the setting of prices in the USSR, the regulation of currency, and customs procedures will be examined in other commissions and committees. The Committee for Glasnost, Citizens Rights, and Appeals is planning to devote its sitting to the draft law on the procedure for recalling a USSR people's deputy.

Political & Social

CPSU Issues Decision on Transition to Market

LD1210113190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1025 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Oct (TASS)—The CPSU Central Committee Plenum calls on Communists and all citizens of the country to consolidate around the ideas of the socialist choice, internationalism, democracy, and humanism put forward by the 28th CPSU Congress, says the decision "On the Situation in the Country and the CPSU Tasks in Connection with the Transition of the Economy to Market Relations," which was published here today.

Paticipants of the plenum protest the attempts of anticommunist, nationalists, and separatist forces to oust the CPSU from political life and to place it outside of the law.

It has been made incumbent on the Politburo and Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee and party committees to provide in time a proper assessment of and a rebuff to underhanded plotting of this sort which are alien to the aims of humanism and democratization of state and society, to strengthen the fight against anticommunism and destructive actions of the extreme forces.

The plenum stresses especially that the situation can be changed for the better only on the basis of cooperation and interaction between all the truly democratic forces of the country. The CPSU Central Committee plenum addresses all public movements and all those who hold dear the present and the future of our homeland, calling on them to consolidate their efforts in the name of civil and national concord.

The CPSU Central Committee sees the main point of transition to the market in, first of all, improving people's lives, ensuring full liberation of their initiative and business activity, and creating clear and reliable stimuli and motivations for highly efficient work within the framework of the socialist choice.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum supports the USSR Supreme Soviet's decisions on measures for stabilizing the country's economic and sociopolitical life and investing the president with additional powers.

To change the situation on the consumer market and to overcome the shortage of basic goods is a primary task. Communists working in the soviets of people's deputies and executive power bodies should speed up the implementation of urgent measures aimed at improving the provision of food for the population, giving practical help in completing the harvest of the produced crops, and establishing order in transportation and trade.

The CPSU Central Committee insists on effective actions by governmental bodies directed at maintaining economic ties, preserving of contractual discipline, overcoming the budget deficit, and strengthening of money circulation. The plan and budget for 1991 should be aimed at resolving the most acute economic and social issues.

The CPSU Central Committee calls on the government to take decisive measures aimed at the fight against speculation, increasing crimes, and manifestations of the extreme forces. Legality should become the main factor in stabilization of the situation in the country.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum advocates a diversity of forms of ownership, a mixed economy, and the formation of a market infrastructure. The plenum considers it exceptionally important to weigh up and forecast comprehensively all the economic, social, and political consequences of the transition to the market and to reduce to a minimum the costs that are inevitable for this crucial period.

The party will oppose the commercialization of culture and other spheres of spiritual life and the reduction of resources allocated to science, education, and culture.

CPSU Central Committee Plenum Speeches

Guseletov Requests 'Specific Action'

PM1110123990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

["Text" of speech delivered at 8 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by B.P. Guseletov, lecturer at the Sverdlovsk Engineering Pedagogical Institute]

[Excerpts] Esteemed Comrades! I cannot, unfortunately, agree with the viewpoint expressed by Comrade Melnikov, who spoke before me about how the party is emerging from the crisis and how the situation is getting, in a manner of speaking, better. Perhaps this is the situation in connection with Moscow, but at least in Sverdlovsk and Sverdlovsk Oblast the state of affairs in the party continues to deteriorate, and this was discussed at the third, the concluding stage of the oblast party conference which ended yesterday. A great deal of criticism was heard from rank-and-file Communists directed at both at the party Central Committee and the newly formed Politburo. I think that today it is very important for you and me to find the reason why the situation continues to deteriorate and to work out a specific action program on this basis.

I seems to me that the main reason lies not only in the work of Politburo members, but in the fact that, in my view, the radical policy chosen by the 28th congress to turn the CPSU from a state organization into a political organization has remained just an intention. There have been practically no specific steps in these three months to ensure that our party is actually turned into a political organization. And here I consider it important to note that the Central Committee and Politburo have a negative role in this. For many a year we have contributed great material and intellectual resources to the party Central Committee. Now, I think, the committee should become the driving force which should stimulate this process, turning the CPSU into a political organization, and help this process go further. I also consider it necessary to note that in multiparty conditions we must forget about the CPSU continuing to control all or most of the processes or spheres in our society's life. We must understand that, if we want to survive as a political organization and, most importantly, want the policy proclaimed in 1985 to survive, we must now concentrate our efforts on certain specific factors, on specific sections of work. If we continue to dissipate our efforts, then the process of the party's stagnation and weakening will just go on and on.

It seems to me—and I mentioned it in my speech at the 28th congress—that one of the main factors is youth policy. And I understand it not in the narrow sense in which we talked about it previously—about the party's influence on the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], the Pioneers, on schoolchildren—but in a wider sense. [passage omitted]. That is, today it is very important to concentrate our efforts on ensuring that youth policy is not left at the level of words but is turned into specific steps aimed at 30-year-olds, 20-year-olds, and even at 10-year-old schoolchildren. [passage omitted].

Virtually all speakers delivering addresses here today have talked about the inactivity of deputies from the CPSU who are working at the congress of people's deputies and in the USSR Supreme Soviet. I utterly and completely agree with this viewpoint, although I think, and from conversations with staffers of the party Central Committee apparatus I know, that they have been given very little help.

Therefore I think that the first step on the road to implementing a youth policy should be the adoption of a law on young people in the near future on the initiative of deputies from the CPSU—a draft of it was submitted long ago to the Komsomol Central Committee, but is simply not being adopted.

Gidaspov Emphasizes Economics

PM1110110090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Speech delivered at 8 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by B.V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee]

[Text] Comrades! Like many of those who have spoken before me or who are sitting here in the auditorium, I believe that our country's economic problems are the most important now. And that is what I want to talk about.

Let me say today that we are very late in discussing these problems. The Central Committee is embarking on the formulation of its political position with regard to an approaching change in the entire social system arising from the transition to the market system.

This is no time to settle scores or put forward claims, but all the same I will permit myself to remind you that we were calling for such a discussion more than a year ago. At conferences and plenums of the Leningrad Oblast party organization and at party meetings. We are well aware that our discussion today is highly necessary, but also to a great extent forced upon us. The crisis situations in society are making people lose confidence in tomorrow and prompting keen protests. Therefore today we must define our positions very clearly and unequivocally and tell the party and all the people the truth as we understand it.

First of all it must be noted that this crucial step is being taken in an atmosphere that could not be more unfavorable from both the political and the economic viewpoint. But we also realize that there is no alternative. As you know, the attitude toward the market as a radical measure to lead society out of the impasse was formulated at the the 28th CPSU Congress. Today few people doubt that this measure is necessary. But a political declaration is one thing, and the introduction of market relations in practice is another.

In the time that has elapsed since the adoption of this decision, we have become increasingly convinced that a market system is possible only with all the associated paraphernalia, including the exploitation of hired labor. And all the terminology about a regulated socialist market is merely a verbal balancing act. We will have poor people and rich people. Therefore we must determine clearly for ourselves the least painful mechanisms for the transition to the market, because they will be painful—and the most important thing here is a mechanism for protecting the population from its negative consequences. It would, of course, be a very good thing if this aspect of the market did not affect our future and our past, first and foremost children and pensioners, but this is, unfortunately, problematic. Stormy debates are currently in progress over the ways of making the transition to the market and the specific programs.

But that is not the crux of the matter. The only thing of political importance now is the fact that we have proclaimed the transition to the market, and as for the mechanism for the transition, this will undoubtedly have to be worked out as we go along. At the same time a number of general questions are matters of principle for Communists. We must promote a transition to the market based on putting an end to alienation from ownership, but not on behalf of people in the abstract or by any possible means. We must seek to turn the specific Soviet individual into the owner, and uphold the right of labor collectives themselves to control the conditions and results of their labor. In this sense we are opposed to total destatization of property owned by the whole people on the basis of the principles of denationalization. But it seems that events could develop in precisely that direction. We believe that today it is more important than ever to consult widely with the people through referendums or in other forms. The impression arising today is that, with the exception of active supporters of the market system and an equally active group of antimarketeers, the greater part of CPSU members and nonparty people are in a state of suspended animation and passive expectancy. What will come of it? The lack of generally accessible information plays a part, of course.

Naturally, we are not calling for a nationwide discussion of the 500 days program or the alternative versions, but it is necessary to know public opinion on the key provisions. The letter to the Central Committee plenum adopted at a joint session of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom [oblast committee] Bureau and the oblast party organization Control and Auditing Commission contains our view on which questions should be submitted for discussion. I hope that we will all look at this letter together. It deals with the introduction of private ownership of land and with limits on privatization of industrial enterprises' fixed capital. People may object that the process of finding out public opinion will mean another delay in the implementation of reform, but I do not think that is so. Whether we like it or not, the practical work of the transition to the market must be accompanied by the implementation of measures to stabilize the political, social, economic, and legal situation. If this is not done, the possible consequences are not difficult to predict. The work of making the transition to the market will itself grind to a halt, the ideas and the people who proposed them will lose their authority, and society will look for other ways out of the situation.

Stabilization measures, as well as a public opinion poll, should play another important role—the role of psychological preparation of the population, especially young people, for the difficult conditions of existence in the conditions of competition for jobs and for a place and position in society. Ultimately, for your own survival and your family's future. We must say this clearly.

It must be admitted frankly that our society is not ready for this at present. I would say categorically, absolutely not ready. We have already begun to take formal steps toward stabilization. Two presidential decrees have been issued. The first on maintaining established economic ties in 1991. The second on priority measures for the transition to market relations.

Judging by the turn of events in the Leningrad region, the first decree has already, figuratively speaking, "bitten the dust," it is not working. What the fate of the second decree will be, time will tell, and it will tell very soon. I am afraid that contract prices will introduce another major disruptive factor into our already complex economic life.

It would be politically erroneous to begin any actions toward the transition to the market without having adopted a Union Treaty. This should make provision for drawing clear demarcation lines between the prerogatives of the center and the republics, between those of the republics and of the autonomous formations, between autonomous formations and regions and even within regions, between oblast and rayon soviets, and you could even go lower.

We talk a great deal about sovereignty. And that is doubtless right. But things must not be taken to absurd levels, so that people are already talking seriously about sovereignty for an enterprise, a settlement soviet, or a neighborhood social self-management committee.

If we want to preserve the USSR, we cannot allow the economy to become a hostage to politicking. One thing is clear, at least for the transitional period we must accept as immutable and fundamental the idea of joint work, a clear economic perspective, and rigorous economic and political discipline. You cannot overcome in 500 or even 1,500 days the consequences of 70 years of a unitarian state. And it is not as simple as all that.

Presidential power has been granted the necessary rights. Unfortunately, at the same time, it seems to us, it has not been given the levers with which to exercise its powers. The vertical power structures that we have been talking about for more than a year have not developed, not even their ideology has been formulated.

It now seems extremely necessary for the levers of presidential rule to be strengthened both centrally and, in particular, locally. Everyone must understand that. Here it is necessary to move on from word to deed. Society is in such a state that the majority will accept this approach and, indeed, expect it.

Last in sequence, and perhaps first in importance. I am talking about the party's place and role in the present complex period of life. I have already said that the party could lose its positions if it becomes an onlooker observing the changes that are taking place. We must be constructive and pragmatic in formulating and pursuing our line. We must have our own program of support for the soviets and the government on the one hand, and on the other we must ensure the party's active participation in all processes, up to and including the constructive planning and formulation of alternative proposals on any aspect of the transition to market relations.

But of course, the most important part of the CPSU's work is its activity in the soviets. We have no right to give Communists any reason to ask perplexedly where is the party, where are the party committees, where is the Central Committee, where is the CPSU leadership, where is the general secretary. After all, we are talking about problems that are of vital importance to everyone, such as the formulation of a system of objectives in the economy and ideology, the identification of the strategy and tactics for achieving them, and the adoption of on-the-spot decisions on the social protection of the population when the situation so requires. Such a concept should, in essence, be the outcome of our plenum's work. On its basis regional, republican, oblast, and rayon party committees would be able to formulate their own positions in relation to local conditions.

I hope that also this week, at the next stage of the Leningrad conference, we will succeed in formulating our tasks and aims with regard to the Leningrad region.

It would also be naive to suppose that the process of privatization of land will proceed identically in, say, the Northwest and in the Krasnodar Chernozem, in the Ukraine and in Central Asia, just as it is naive to think that the privatization of a barber's shop and the Izhorskiy Zavod plant are processes of an identical nature. Without a clear CPSU position the party committees will find themselves facing spontaneous forces, and will be unable seriously to influence the Communists' minds and mobilize them to resolve the questions facing society.

In conclusion I wish to say that we are optimists, we are confident that collective reason and collective action will help us to resolve all the complex problems that life has set us. Only we should not be afraid to confront these problems, and we must not pretend that nothing is happening.

Medvedev Offers Academic Approach

PM1110134990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

["Text" of speech delivered at 8 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by R.A. Medvedev, writer and member of USSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! Events in our country in both political and economic life are now proceeding so rapidly that even we historians and scientists find it very hard to keep track of the course of these events. And we will probably spend many more years studying the change in the situation in our country week by week and month by month and analyzing the events and processes now taking place in our country, in the Soviet Union. The situation in the country today is already completely different from a year ago, the situation is not even the same as it was in the spring. The party is no longer a direct state institution, although it remains the ruling party. The party now exists under the conditions of a multiparty system, and there is nothing you can do about it now. We now have political trends, groups, and organizations of absolutely all types and orientations which existed before in tsarist Russia and also all shades of Western political thought are represented in our country by various groupings and trends.

Four basic groups of this kind can be singled out. First there are the extremist nationalist groupings or more moderate nationalist groupings, which are very strong not only in the union republics but also in our Russian Federation. The second direction is, let us be frank, not simply a democratic but a bourgeois democratic direction, a Westernizing direction seeking to build a Western capitalist model of democracy and the market.

The third direction, let us provisionally call it the party conservative direction, is that of the type of group or party of Nina Andreyeva. The fourth is the direction along which the party is mainly proceeding. Previously this was once called the party's general line, but since it is nonetheless not a straight line, and, as Mdivani—he used to be a popular politician—used to say at party congresses, our general line is proceeding in zigzags, but it is nonetheless going forward and we must follow it [sentence as published]. But when we have a multiparty system the party must learn itself to struggle for its line and to promote popular leaders, including young party members, from its milieu. Communicating with students at Leningrad and Moscow universities, speaking in the Central Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] school, and taking part in a seminar of young sociologists held by the Komsomol Central Committee, where everyone, under the age of 35, was regarded as young, I saw that at this level the party has tremendous intellectual forces which, unfortunately, it does not always put into operation. I also wanted to say that not only the formal [as published] press organs, as has been said here, are attacking the party. The party is also being attacked by entirely official press organs sometimes distributed in millions of copies. I have to hand the journal RODINA—the now official organ of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. I shall read just an extract from one article. It is by Larisa Piyasheva, a candidate of economic sciences, who writes a very great deal. Only two days ago she wrote a big article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA. Here is her model for transition to the market which obviously also reflects the opinion of those who offer Piyasheva the pages of their newspapers and journals: "When I think about ways of resurrecting our country, nothing occurs to me except moving the experience of the German 'economic miracle' to our territory. TWe mustform, as Adenauer's government did, economic liberalism within a record time, ban communist ideology, implement an all-Russian process of repentance, denouncing all 'instigators,' if only posthumously, cast off the burden of totalitarianism, bury Lenin's ashes, remove to the museums all socialist-communist symbols, and liberate completely all the entrepreneurial initiative which has survived and been preserved in society. My hope is that the released 'spirit of enterprise' will resurrect the desire for life and the 'protestant ethic' in the country.

"We must finally sober up and at least ask ourselves: Could Hitler and Goebbels have resurrected the overthrown, divided, and morally devastated Germany after the war?"

Piyasheva compares our party with the party of Hitler and Goebbels. But as a historian I must say that the Hitlers and Goebbels of this world come not from the weakened administration which rules the country, they come from the rally-obsessed, populist, anarchist mob, they come on the crest of demagoguery and lies. That is where the Hitlers and Goebbels come from. That threat does exist in our country. One can cite numerous examples of the kindling of destructive and anarchist sentiments in some items in OGONEK and other press organs ith a print run of millions which meet with no rebuttal. IZVESTIYA has been criticized here but I shall say that recently IZVESTIYA has provided several fine examples of subtle, intelligent, and very good criticism in editorials. There was Ivanov's speech on television in Leningrad, and in an editorial IZVESTIYA gave a fine analysis of this absurd and stupid but demagogic speech; a number of other speeches by opponents of the party have been criticized very subtly, without loud words, and very clearly by IZVESTIYA, and I liked that. And readers also liked it, I know. Of course, our party press and PRAVDA have become more active and better, but a very great deal more needs to be said here so that our party press can reach the level where people believe it and can rebuff demagogues through our media (and the party has enormous media at its disposal).

The ideologist A. Tsipko, not stupid but I cannot say particularly knowledgeable or profound, has appeared in our country. He has global pretensions—exposing Marxism and Leninism. I shall cite only a few quotations from A. Tsipko's article in NOVYY MIR—and that is a journal with a print run of nearly 3 million. Tsipko writes about Marx with extreme familiarity. I do not want to say that Marx was always right, that Marx never made any mistakes or that Lenin never made mistakes. Even Marx can be criticized, we need doctrinal criticism now, we are living in the late 20th century, not the middle of the 19th century. But here is what Tsipko writes:

"Nothing so develops the mind and heart as the search for god,"
"violence can never be a lever of history,"
"our road was a road to nowhere,"
"we let ourselves be deceived and completely destroyed our state and culture,"
"the root of all the terrible crimes lies not in Stalin but in the initial idea of the collectivization of social life,"
"capitalism does not prepare socialism,"
"Marx and Engels... could not see or consider obvious things'"
"the teaching of Marx and Engels on communism cannot even be called an entirely scientific hypothesis because... everything is built on faith", and so on and so forth.

And there are plenty of examples of this kind in the press. The books and articles of A. Avtorkhanov are being published now. Avtorkhanov was perhaps not a stupid man but nonetheless it was he who in 1942 when the Germans were approaching Checheno-Ingutiya went over to the Germans' side and headed the newspaper GAZAVAT, whose title page stated: "Hitler is with us, allah is above us" and which engaged in the recruitment of fighters for the antipartisan detachments and a special Hitlerite team. And then he worked for 30 years as a teacher of Marxism-Leninism in American military intelligence schools. And this Avtorkhanov, who has written many books, is now being published by OKTYABR and OGONEK. Let them publish him, but let them also say who the author is. But the information given about the author says that the author studied at the red professors' institute and emigrated to the West after the war. And that is all. The reader should know what kind of an author this is, because as a historian I can say that alongside sensible thoughts this author also cites a large quantity of simple fabrications and outright lies. Just as there are many deliberate lies in the works of former Politburo secretary Bazhenov, who fled to the West in 1926, which have been published in OGONEK. Outright lies are also published in many other items in our press. Not only criticism but outright lies. And our party press is not rebutting this.

Therefore, not being an economist and with no opportunity to study all the economic platforms and programs submitted to us, I want to say that it is no use for the comrades here to sometimes appeal and say: The president did not defend us or the Politburo did not defend us, or let the law enforcement organs defend us. The party is a political organization and it does not suit the party to turn to Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin or Defense Minister Yazov or anyone else. The party, possessing 18 million members—young, old and middle-aged—and possessing primary organizations at every enterprise and an enormous army of party intelligentsia, which has now been to a considerable extent relegated to second or third position, can do a lot. It is the party man, the economic leader, the professional party worker, who predominates in our country, while the party intelligentsia, which comprised the basis of our party under Lenin, has been relegated to third position. Stalin did not need the party intelligentsia, and he destroyed it. Khrushchev did not need it, still less did Brezhnev need it, yet without it it is impossible to preserve and develop the party's political or intellectual capital. That is why the party must appeal not so much to the law enforcement organs, not to the president, and not to the internal troops, it must find in itself the political, moral, and intellectual reserves which will enable it to vanquish its political opponents. We must learn the methods of civilized political struggle since the party is now becoming a truly political party.

We also have a question for the general secretary and USSR president. Mikhail Sergeyevich, will we continue to be subjected to mockery in the Baltic for a long time to come? Can something be done? Tell us where we should go and we will go, if necessary. But no one is waiting for us anywhere. What is more, agreements have now begun to appear. People are now intimidating us—there is virtually no union government, that is no secret to you. People are saying that the union government controls nothing. Everyone has now become independent and sovereign—from the autonomous republics to the union republics. We are told that the union government will not defend you now, but we have an agreement with Russia. Take Leningrad—we've got a treaty with it—take Moscow—we've got an agreement with it. Where will you turn now? You'll do everything that we tell you. No one will protect you.

People are asking: What should we do, what are our lives going to be like in the future? We thought that it looked as though the situation in the republic was becoming somewhat calmer of late. That may indeed be the case, we thought, we have somehow begun to behave in a more seemly fashion. We may think that they have understood and are coming to meet us halfway. But this is merely silence or the lull before the storm. Ten days ago Lauristin gave a huge interview and former Premier Toome gave a long interview which once again confirmed unequivocally that "immigrants" can never have the same rights in Estonia as the republic's indigenous inhabitants. Yet here we are discussing privatization.

Comrades, only citizens of the Estonian SSR will be able to have the right to own land and houses. What will be left for us then?

Unfortunately, I want to state that the leadership of the independent Estonian Communist Party is buoyed up by the so-called increase in national self-awareness. The wakening of national self-awareness is right and necessary. But can it be based on the humiliation of others and fail to take their feelings into consideration? Let us ask the leaders of the independent Estonian Communist Party whether they celebrated the 9 May holiday. They did not. Did they celebrate the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Estonia even if only with just a small ceremonial event? No, they did not. What about the 46th anniversary of Tallinn's liberation from the German fascist invaders? No. Nor do they intend to celebrate the impending 7 November holiday. If we respect the feelings of the republic's indigenous inhabitants, we should, after all, respect the feelings of all the others. That is the only way to organize policy.

The fate of the Estonian Communist Party has virtually been decided. We numbered 105,000 1 January, today, according to the latest figures, there are 57,000 of us—50 percent of which have not paid their membership dues today and have not surrendered their party cards. Roughly speaking, the result will be that we are left with those people who firmly adhere to CPSU positions, something in the order of 25-30,000 of the 105,000. To date the independent Estonian Communist Party has 5,000 members, of whom 1,500 are simultaneously members of the CPSU and have received white slips in their party cards I want to say that, regrettably, the exodus from the party increased in many respects after the 28th congress. This is attributable to the fact that both the new and old Central Committee Politburo refuse to interfere in the republic Communist Party's affairs. Communists are asking: Why does the CPSU Central Committee not recognize us. Because we advocate a united renewed Soviet Union (and the independent Estonian Communist Party advocates Estonia's seceding from the USSR)? Because we advocate a united and renewed CPSU (and the independent Estonian Communist Party advocates an alliance of parties)? Mikhail Sergeyevich, do you really not realize that the CPSU is the only thread linking us to the center? While the general secretary is the president, we have the hope that we will be defended and will not be abandoned, although this is only a hope, but it does inspire us with confidence all the same.,

Today the independent Estonian Communist Party (with 5,000 members or so) has possession of [vladeyet] all Estonian Communist Party property and finances, while our 40,000 supporters are forced to manage just on the meager membership dues without having the profits either from the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee publishing house or from other subdepartments. Whether we like it or not, whether this is a shame or not—this is, of course, only to be regretted—we have two central committees and two parties. This situation contributes to the undoing of Communists within the Estonian Communist Party every day yet in the independent Estonian Communist Party there are virtually none left, they have virtually nothing to lose, but they will still be able to completely wipe us out, since people everywhere are saying that the CPSU Central Committee does not recognize Communists who see themselves within a unified CPSU and they seem to be right. Open the documents which you have been given and see what is written against Gusev's surname. Both the Central Committee and its apparatus have deprived the Estonian Communist Party of its leaders both at the 28th congress and today.

By and large it is just as in the fairytale: The underdog has to carry the can. There may very soon be no one in the Estonian republic to act as vehicles of CPSU policy and of the issues which we settle at plenums.

Comrades, don't get the wrong idea, this is not railing at fate, but a cri de coeur. Comrade leaders, look around you, you are constantly being deceived. Here people swear love, but elsewhere they engage in daily betrayal. The fact that we have been cast to the whim of fate is an insult but it cannot break us because industrial enterprise workers are the foundation of our party organizations and they cannot be broken.

Akhmedov Questions Sovereignity

*PM1110144690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Oct 90 First Edition p 6*

[Speech delivered at 9 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by Kh.A. Akhmedov, chairman of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! It is quite clear that the transition to market relations is inevitable. Furthermore it is now the only possible step capable of extricating the country's economy from the grip of crisis.

What, in our view, should be worked on promptly? The most important thing is, in the process of implementing the proposed measures to strengthen the unionwide market, to secure the preservation of the USSR's integrity. I understand that the draft program speaks of a union of sovereign states. But who can answer this key question today: Is the Union a sovereign state?

Even Comrade Ivashko's report showed some doubt on this point. In this connection it seems expedient and very important to incorporate in the program a package of measures aimed at preserving the integrity of the USSR as a renovated state, but still with a federal structure, in which both individual republics and the USSR as a whole can operate as legal entities [subyekty prava].

Obviously it is also necessary, in the course of the coming drastic and very painful changes, to take maximum account of the republics' particular interests. Comrade Karamanov, chairman of the Kazakhstan Council of Ministers, spoke here yesterday. We agree with his main conclusions and proposals.

This is relevant first and foremost to republics whose economy is clearly oriented toward raw materials, whose national economic structure is imperfect, and whose social sphere is backward. It is no secret that Turkmenistan comes into this category. Out of all the output we export, nearly 80 percent consists of raw materials, and this accounts for one-seventh of the country's production of cotton fiber, one-eighth of its gas, and so forth. Given this situation, it is entirely reasonable for us to count on direct participation by the republic in the sale of exported raw materials on both the domestic and the foreign market. It is also entirely justified to give priority to the republics in setting prices for exported raw materials. Taking account, of course, of statewide interests. This state of affairs, among other things, will help to equalize the republics' starting points, because this cannot be done in some other way, as the economic scientists try to persuade us.

In one of his speeches Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put forward these correct points: "You cannot adopt identical solutions for all regions of the republics without taking into account the peculiarities, characteristics, and conditions of life." For instance, speaking at all levels, representatives of the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan ask that account be taken of the specific raw materials situation and the starting conditions, and yet this matter is not being examined by any official body.

If firm prices are now set for the fuel and energy complex, cotton, and various other types of output, we will create intolerable conditions for these republics and corresponding difficulties and dissatisfaction among the people. In our view the land privatization proposals absolutely must not be adopted. Above all, the proposed procedure totally fails to take account of the specific conditions of irrigation farming, where land plots are provided with irrigation water from unified, technologically complex water distribution systems. In these circumstances, how can water be supplied on an individual basis, and what can be done about the fact that each plot belongs to a specific crop rotation system, without which the cultivation of many agricultural crops is impossible? Where can answers be found to these questions? Unfortunately, there are no answers. We consider it necessary to establish—as is proposed, in general, in the report—that the time frame and forms of implementation of land reform should be determined by the republic itself after an all-around discussion of the problem with all its population. Everyone is particularly concerned about the question of social compensation on the transition to the market and of minimizing the losses that are already arising. What can we say to this? Only one thing: If our party seriously intends to express and defend the working people's interests, these questions should be an area of keen attention on its part. We should occupy tough positions, so to speak, in this salient.

Unfortunately we are still more inclined here merely to state our positions, while continuing in practice to regard the social sphere as an appendage that is presumably needed, but is not always essential. What is needed is not simply a call to help people, but an awareness of the need and concrete practical action to create an effective mechanism for protecting the working people's masses.

In our republic the level of social development is already one-third to one-half lower than the average indicators for the Union. One in five of the adult population capable of working is not employed in the sphere of social labor. In order to eliminate this, on the basis of studies carried out in the republic, we propose that index-linking of incomes be carried out from the very beginning of 1991 not less than once every three months, with regular publication in the press. Otherwise it will inevitably fall behind, and then it is virtually impossible to make up lost ground.

I would also like to dwell on another question. We in the republics are now trying to create joint enterprises. On this matter we are already beginning to lose confidence in each other: one republic in another, and the republics in general in the center. When you go to the union ministers about various questions concerning joint enterprises or simply existing enterprises, the first question they ask is: Are you one of ours, or theirs? How are we to understand that?

We joined Russia more than 100 years ago, and now the question that has arisen is absolutely incomprehensible to us. Yet the ministries and departments do not intend even to complete projects that are already under construction. The attitude that has developed among us today is incomprehensible.

If the question is being discussed with another country—a capitalist country—we are fully prepared to accept and create all the necessary conditions. Yet when the discussion is taking place within the country—there is no trust! Therefore what is needed above all is trust between the republics and the Union. Otherwise it is not clear by what path we can advance further. Obviously there must also be a united approach at the center, so that the union republics are not classified as ours or theirs.

And in general, on what basis and how will the solution to the crisis and the transition to the market take place—that is the most important criterion for the ruling party. In our view it is necessary persistently to come to grips with the new situation, to learn the market, to teach it to people, and to explain to them the nature of the measures being adopted. In short, how the party acts at this point in time will determine not only its own fate, but the fate of the program for the transition to the market.

Karamanov Discusses Transition

PM1110134390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

["Text" of speech delivered at 8 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by U. Karamanov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] Comrades! The problem of transferring our economy to market relations has now spread from the sphere of scientific and economic interests into the dimension of life and is beginning to take hold of the public mind. This is not surprising, since our people's hope of a better life is pinned on the market. So with every passing day the market has fewer and fewer opponents. However, there is a wide spread of opinion regarding mechanisms for entering the market, the sequence of stages, and the duration of the transitional period. Therefore we regard the main task of the present plenum of our party's Central Committee as being to elaborate a coordinated position or at least bring about the maximum possible rapprochement between the viewpoints of republic communist parties and regional party organizations.

For our state, with its complex federative structure, multinational population, and neglected economy, this path is the only correct one, in our view. However, negative processes are continuing to build up in society and the country is sinking increasingly deeply into a maelstrom of socioeconomic difficulties. In order to emerge from this situation, which can be described as almost catastrophic, we cannot tolerate further confrontation. We must pool efforts and return at long last to concepts like "friendship among the peoples" and "internationalism." Only all together will we be able to preserve everything valuable accumulated by our peoples over their age-old history.

In order achieve these goals, there is a need for effective activity on the part of the CPSU and its Central Committee. The party and society were saying this with great concern on the eve of the 28th party congress. In fact matters have turned out differently. The congress was held and adopted a detailed resolution on practically all spheres of the country's sociopolitical and socioeconomic life. Another three months have passed, but none of the congress political documents is being seriously implemented. The CPSU is continuing to lose its role as consolidating force. The newly formed state structures and certain parliaments and soviets are excessively keen on elaborating platforms and programs, which are often out of touch with real life. Debates and rallies flare up on any pretext, and often without any reason at all. Meanwhile everything that we worked so hard to create over the decades is crumbling before our very eyes.

The market economy is our future. But if today we are unable to focus all efforts on resolving practical matters, then tomorrow we will lose even what we have today.

Kazakhstan's position regarding the proposed plans and principles for switching to the market is well known. It has been repeatedly set out at sessions of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the Council of the Federation, the Presidential Council, and the USSR Council of Ministers. I think that the present plenum represents a good opportunity once again to convey our position to all interested parties.

First of all the variant readings and imprecise wording in defining the subjects of ownership rights must be eliminated from the program. We proceed from the premise that all national wealth, including land, mineral reserves, other natural resources, and the created potential within the borders of the republic in question, are the republic's inalienable property. This is a fundamentally important basic point without which the economic sovereignty of republics proclaimed in the draft program will remain empty talk. Unless you enjoy ownership, you cannot be economically independent. We have already proved this by the entire course of our development. This principle is vitally important for Kazakhstan since the foundation of its economy is constituted by the raw material sectors and basic production, which to this day is the domain of the center. It looks as though a similar doctrine is also being applied to the sphere of price formation, where it is planned to retain state price regulation for basic fuel and energy resources and raw material resources. This approach deliberately places us in a still more dependent position. Therefore, taking into account the real situation in the national economy, we will clearly have to determine contract prices ourselves and subsequently switch to free prices close to world prices. As for 1991, we support the expediency of retaining the existing wholesale prices.

We fundamentally cannot agree with the retention of an all-embracing state monopoly in the sphere of foreign economic activity. Unless the republic has sufficiently full rights in these matters, there can be no question of a market economy. In this connection we believe it is necessary to fundamentally revise approaches toward forming the republic's hard currency fund, which must also be created according to the single-channel principle. Payments will be made from this fund into local soviet budgets and, on a treaty basis, into the union budget, including to repay the USSR debt.

We can see that the existing system of material and technical supply is on its last legs. The destruction of economic ties is reaching the critical point beyond which the collapse of the whole economy is inevitable. We realize the sheer perniciousness of the pseudorevolutionary disruption of established ties. In this case there will be no winners. Therefore we call on the remaining republics to preserve them at the existing level.

A new system of intersectorial and interregional ties in which sovereign republics are the dominant subjects is now emerging. The Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has established mutually advantageous economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation with the Central Asian republics and recently signed an intergovernmental agreement with the Belorussian SSR, and these questions are also being studied with other union republics.

We regard this as a real manifestation of the principles of economic autonomy and of our right to dispose of our own resources in the interests of the population of Kazakhstan and other republics which have contractual relations with us.

Kazakhstan has always sought to honestly fulfill its pledges, often to its own detriment, and has given the interests of the union priority over the interests of the republic. Therefore, no matter how hard the situation may be, we are prepared to maintain interrepublic deliveries at last year's level, given, of course, similar pledges by the other republics.

Comrades! I have to dwell on the important point of the timetable, pace, and scale for implementation of the reform. While observing the general principles that must constitute the basis for the formation of the unionwide market and ensure coordination and harmony between the actions of all political, state, and regional power and management structures, it is necessary to renounce overregulation of the implementation of most of the projected measures.

For instance, in Kazakhstan the rate of privatization of ownership, especially initially, will be considerably lower than in the union as a whole and many other union republics. This stems from the heavy industry bias in the structure of the economy, the extremely uneven siting of productive forces on the republic's territory, and the multinational makeup of the population. A failure to fully consider each of these circumstances may entail not only new economic distortions and increased social tension, but also a deterioration in the political situation. Therefore we regard it as necessary to overcome the desire to again dictate from the center who should make what, when, and how. Within the context of the all-union strategy each republic must determine its own specific ways of achieving the objective. We must abandon the perfectly understandable and alluring desire to secure an accelerated transition to the market. After all, we already have bitter lessons in "acceleration." You will agree that it will take a considerable time merely to enter the market. And it will take much longer to form a full-blooded market, so the degree of risk at this truly crucial moment must be determined as correctly and objectively as possible.

The topic of "the market and its consequences for the country's population" merits separate discussion. As for long-term forecasts, here opinions seem to be unanimous: The perestroyka of the economy will result in a considerable improvement in living standards for working people. Matters are far worse with regard to forecasts for the immediate future. But it is tomorrow that is going to determine people's attitude toward perestroyka and its creators. However, the switch to the new economic management conditions will inevitably entail a deterioration in the living standards of working people, especially low-income strata of the population. And although the union programs envisage compensation measures, these will scarcely cover all the social costs. So, while pandering to euphoria at the hypothetical successes and achievements, we are omitting to mention the considerable difficulties that people will experience. What are we afraid of? After all, when privation comes knocking on the door of ordinary working people, no one is going to recall economists' calculations. They will say: The party is to blame, it promised us swift prosperity, but in reality the opposite has happened. I believe, and this is our firm position, that right now we should be bluntly and openly warning people: Yes, at first it will be hard, because we will have to abandon the practice whereby income is not dependent on each person's contribution to social production. But we have to go through this, we have to bite the bullet, because otherwise the whole of society is doomed to flounder in the same maelstrom of socioeconomic disarray. And so that the party's voice rings out more loudly and is heard by every Soviet person, mass political work should be begun in labor collectives. The party, I think, must have sufficient prestige for people to trust it. Ultimately this is not just a question of the economy and social policy. It is a question of the future of the CPSU itself.

Comrades! This CPSU Central Committee Plenum is being held in an atmosphere of social tension. In the future, in conditions of the emergence of a multiparty system, it will be far more difficult to win the people's trust. Are we ready for the difficulties which certainly lie in store for the party and every Communist? I hope that our plenum's decisions will answer that question, which is a difficult one for every one of us.

Nenashev on 'Credit of Trust'

PM1110115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

["Text" of speech delivered at 8 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! First, about the evolution of a concept we have been using a lot in recent years. The party's credit of trust. You recall how, in starting the changes in 1985, we stated that the party had received a credit of trust from the people and was obliged to spend it. A year later we recalled that this credit was not open-ended and that time was running out fast. A year after that we began to recall, with anxiety now, that the credit of trust in the party was being exhausted. Now we are already saying with sorrow that this credit has been largely exhausted and that we have a lot of new work to do to not only preserve trust but also to win back what has been lost.

In the evolution of this concept I can clearly see the stages of the decline of the party's prestige and of trust in it. In my opinion the 19th party conference was the borderline here. We remember the trust with which the 19th party conference was greeted. Without any exaggeration it should be said that at the time Soviet people's hopes were linked with the party, because it had the main thing—initiative.

For everyone at the time there was no doubt that the party had begun perestroyka, it was the first to state that we could not live in the old way, it began a radical economic reform, and at that conference it proclaimed the need for fundamental changes in the sphere of politics, the sphere of power.

Everything that has been happening to the party since the 19th conference can be described simply as the loss of initiative. We rightly explain this and now often speak of it as being a case of a party created and adapted for the authoritarian administrative system, a party created to issue edicts and to obey, being unable to keep up with the rapid events and radical changes in society and losing one position after another and one campaign after another.

I say this by no means to argue that if it were possible to begin everything again then much could have been done differently or with fewer losses. I fully agree in this case with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who said in his introductory speech in particular that being wise after the event is not a very rewarding business. So I will not continue this digression into our recent past, as it gives us no joy or optimism.

I want to raise a question that, to be completely honest, we are now asking ourselves more and more often: Is our party's position hopeless or does it have the ability and the means to become, in this time of extraordinary complexity for our society and for the country, not verbally but in reality the leading political force of society?

I belong to the optimists and in contrast to the pessimists I believe that at the most complex (it is hard to name another time so complex and crucial) stage of our society the party has been able to retain its main asset—it has been able to preserve the unity of its ranks and its ties with the people.

I think that the main achievement of our 28th congress, however complex it was for us and however contradictory, is that it did not allow the party to be split and it preserved it on a new democratic basis as the leading force of society, the people's main hope, and a guarantee that all changes will be implemented in its interests and for its benefit.

Pondering all the complexities and difficulties of the present situation connected with the transition to the market, I think that a great deal will now depend on a correct understanding of the assessment of the processes taking place and the changes occurring in people's moods.

I want to make a special mention of people's moods—the most important factor. Here, in my opinion the party must first simply grasp the initiative. What is at issue in assessing the situation and displaying initiative? In other words: Perhaps not everyone will agree with me, but it seems to me that a contradictory but most unique situation is taking shape in the country.

On the one hand it is obvious to everyone that all contradictions—economic, social, and political—have reached an extreme, critical point. And on the other the extreme acuteness of the situation, when truly the Fatherland is in danger, and we have one and the same Fatherland, obliges all sane people, and they form the absolute majority, to wonder what will happen next: chaos, anarchy, sliding into the abyss? And it is this fact, this uniqueness of the present situation, which has been fomenting, at first at a low level but now, it seems to me, at a higher and higher one, the wave of feeling in favor of reason and common sense.

Under these critical conditions it seems to me that two themes and two problems are acquiring importance as the key, deciding ones in people's awareness. They are the theme of consensus, of civil peace in our society, and the theme of power and the stability, order, and vigorous actions by executive power connected with it. I think that the present time is characterized by the fact that almost the last point has come where there is still hope, where people still have faith that everything can still be changed if we set about it all together.

This hope, this faith, unless the party switches to actions and heads the struggle for consensus and civil peace may, I think, be replaced by universal despondency, apathy, and complete lack of faith. And then it can be supposed that society will be in a dangerous state and become quarry for the extreme left-wing or extreme right-wing forces.

I don't know about other people but I for one am most surprised when there is talk about how the party organizations cannot find themselves and do not know what to do. Is the task of pooling the efforts of all categories and all strata of Soviet people irrespective of profession, status, and nationality, is this not the task around which it would be possible today to unite all the best intellectual forces in the party and into which it would be possible to channel all political organizational work, everything the party has and everything we have learned over these past five years of perestroyka?

Another thing. We have now all grown tired of wailing, of shouting about our plight, largely with the aid of the mass media—and I admit frankly that here television plays one of the largest roles. There is an unprecedented competition to see who can show the full depth of our fall most eloquently and expressively. The inertia of criticism, the inertia of denunciation and destruction, has reached its apogee and is irritating people increasingly, we can feel this increasingly frequently. And I think that it is not least this factor which will influence the course of the subscription campaign. Under these conditions, the theme of deeds, the theme of action as a counterweight to the chatter and obsession with meetings of which everyone is tired is acquiring particular importance. And here, it seems to me, the party's initiative in resolving the most urgent concerns, the most urgent vital affairs of the people, of Soviet people of all categories, could have almost decisive significance for its authority. It is no accident that you have noted recently, as was also mentioned in M.S. Gorbachev's introductory speech, how in the complex time of the city's preparation for winter, when the question of laying in vegetables and repairing housing and heat pipelines has been raised very acutely, when the rayon and city committees have remembered how they used to do this in the quite recently past, they have displayed initiative and how this has added to their prestige and people's trust in them.

In this connection I think that today under the new conditions of the perestroyka in its structure and the introduction of new methods of activity what the party should fear most of all is the complex of noninterference. And this complex is beginning to take shape increasingly persistently. It is a complex, if you like, of some kind of shyness and inadequacy. As a counterweight to this we Communists must say out loud that even under the new conditions the party has been and will remain answerable for everything. It is answerable for the present and future of our land and our Fatherland. And in that sense it can have no complex of noninterference or any manifestation of inadequacy. I am sure that if the party is able to display initiative now in this complicated time for our society and primarily on these two problems which I am convinced are key ones, it will be able to become not verbally but in reality the leading political force of our society.

Masaliyev Questions Time Frame

PM1110111990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

["Text" of speech delivered at 8 October session of CPSU Central Committee Plenum by A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! Our plenum is to define the CPSU Central Committee's position regarding the country's transition to a market economy. Let us be blunt and frank: This is an utterly fundamental and serious issue. It is a question of our homeland's future. To be or not to be for the USSR—a united federative socialist state! It is a question of the fate of the many millions of Soviet people. Of how representatives of each nation and nationality are going to build their relations with one another. We Central Committee members will be assuming a tremendous responsibility in deciding "yes" or "no." As we all realize, the transition to the market is not a clear-cut step. Our perestroyka has brought us to it. Very regrettably, the country is in a difficult situation.

It has to be noted again today that, by proclaiming and extensively developing democracy and glasnost, giving an opportunity to any "initiative," and criticizing and rejecting the past, we are creating a mood and an idea among people, especially young people, that the socialist system for which millions of our compatriots fought and gave their lives has now allegedly exhausted its potential and is incapable of creating prosperity for people. Of course, this is absolutely untrue. It also has to be said that central party and state organs have withdrawn from daily organizational work on the pretext of transferring power to local level. A country with a huge territory consisting of 15 union republics and many large-scale national economic sectors and constituting a complex living organism is essentially no longer being properly run. I believe that this is the most serious omission in our activity. In many places democracy has been turned into demagoguery and discipline has been thoroughly shattered. The destructive forces that have emerged are intensifying the negative processes. Many mass news media are providing "active help" in this. They are covering the situation in the regions one-sidedly and only in a negative light.

We largely agree with the theses formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's introductory speech and in the report. At the same time I want to express my attitude to the market economy and the program that has been elaborated regarding it. Above all my criticisms and doubts.

One. It would be naive to think that the transition to the market will take place over a short time, say 500 days, as proposed, or that it will make it possible in the very near future to provide the population with a sufficient quantity of various goods and foodstuffs, or that it will accelerate the solution of social and everyday problems. Scientists' calculations and arguments are purely theoretical and do not take into account our level of discipline and the total inexperience of state and economic organs and their cadres.

Two. The rigid, peremptory approach toward the mass sale and transfer of state and cooperative enterprises and farms to private owners is totally unrealistic and inadequately substantiated, especially as there will be a limited number of new entrepreneurs able to acquire them and organize the uninterrupted production of output needed by the people. And in conditions of our republic's many mountain rayons, where sheep-raising is the main activity, although there are many farms there with low profitability, the projected privatization is, I think, altogether unacceptable.

Here are some proposals and requests. Clearly, Comrades, we cannot avoid a market economy, we have already gone a long way. But the resolution of this question must be approached with the greatest responsibility, there must be no haste, everything must be weighed up, any mistake in this matter, when everything is changing, may be very expensive. As comrades have already said, it is advisable to submit for nationwide discussion the program for transferring the country to the new system of work, so that every citizen senses and understands its essence and is a direct participant in implementing the program. Without concealing anything, we must tell people frankly what awaits us and what the difficulties may be. If we want to have more of the goods we need, which is the chief aim of the market, in my opinion, we should begin privatization not with restaurants, stores, and cafeterias, which can operate successfully in state hands, but with loss-making and low-profitability enterprises and farms and organize and secure increased production of various goods and items there.

I think that rapid and massive privatization is unrealistic. So during the transitional period, and also in general, lease, contract, and other efficient forms of economic management that yield high results should be retained, deepened, and improved. We cannot teeter from one extreme to the other. Everything valuable must be consolidated and utilized and a respectful attitude must be shown to the experience of the past.

Comrades! We are seriously perturbed by the problems of evening out republics' starting conditions. For instance, it is not Kirghizia's fault that it has found itself in the role of raw material appendage to more economically developed regions. For many years wool, leather and fur raw materials, fermented tobacco, and subassemblies for electrical industry equipment have been shipped from here to various parts of the country. One-half of the generated electricity is transferred to neighboring republics. In other words, a considerable proportion of the profits has been transferred, and now we are being reproached for the fact that Kirghizia receives a subsidy.

So we believe that the program for switching to the market should envisage creating a special union fund which can be used via a "subvention" system to support the appropriate territories.

It has to be said that the interregional economic ties that have operated for many years are now being destroyed. Enterprises are suffering great losses because of the disruption of deliveries. There is no longer any question of stability and rhythm in production.

We are trying to organize links with other republics on a fundamentally new basis. We are concluding intergovernmental agreements and establishing direct economic contracts between enterprises. This work naturally takes some time, but the functioning of the national economy cannot be halted for even a day. We regard it as advisable to legislatively retain for the next two years the USSR Council of Ministers state order for delivery of basic types of raw materials. Of course, this order should be given new forms and a new content and supplier-enterprises' interest in it should be increased via the system of prices, credit, and profits. Thought should be given to retaining planning for the most important directions of our development.

Important production facilities of union and interrepublic significance are now being constructed in the regions. Nikolay Ivanovich [Ryzhkov], we believe it is necessary to prevent the mothballing of these projects and to complete construction, making provision for the relevant capital investments.

Mikhail Sergeyevich [Gorbachev]! The situation in the country is becoming more complex. Various antisocial actions are not meeting with a rebuff. In the interests of the cause the president, the Supreme Soviet, and the government should toughen up their exigency regarding the fulfillment of laws, decrees, and decisions. The leaders of central and republican organs must be held more accountable.

Esteemed colleagues from the Union republics! Sovereignty is a good thing. But a one-sided understanding of it excluding the interests of the whole country and fraternal republics will not allow us to move forward. Let us approach the development of our own territories and regions in the light of our common, international tasks, at the level of agreements and existing state orders, and let us support one another.

There is one final issue I am going to touch on. The proposed forms and methods of switching to the market are arousing alarm and tension in labor collectives. Essentially, having initiated perestroyka, the party in fact finds itself outside perestroyka in resolving a number of important questions. This is causing concern among Communists and a decline in the role of primary party organizations, is seriously influencing the sociopolitical situation, and is deepening the state of uncertainty and disunity. At meetings with working people you hear many criticisms over this. The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat and all republic and local party committees must seek and find ways of strengthening the prestige of primary party organizations and the title of member of the CPSU.

Sillari Addresses Plenum

PM1210093190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Oct 90 First Edition pp 6-7

["Text" of speech delivered at 9 October session of CPSU Central Committee plenum by E.-A.A. Sillari, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! I would like to begin my speech with an idea which, in my opinion, defines the situation in the country—that of a general crisis in the socioeconomic system, including the national-state structure and ideology, a crisis which has revealed the nonviability of the existing structures.

This was artificially disguised for a long time by extensive use of human and natural resources. In our republic of Estonia, this was manifest particularly prominently, possibly owing to the smallness of the republic, where every contrast and contradiction is particularly visible. We are all the more sharply aware of the consequences now—both in the economic sphere and in the sphere of politics and interethnic relations.

Disputes as to whether we should or should not switch to the market look strange against the backdrop of this very profound crisis.... What will happen to the country if we switch to the market?

But, for all intents and purposes, the question is a different one: What will happen to the country if we do not switch to the market in the near future?

The collapse of the administrative command system is an objective process. We should not resist it. Moreover, it is impossible to do so. We must combat the phenomena which are currently coming to replace the administrative command system—anarchy, disorder, and lawlessness. We do not have a mechanism for implementing our decisions and laws. Piling up one on top of another, they are in effect making no impact on real everyday life. I do not want to frighten anyone but, if this situation continues, the Land of the Soviets will return to the ruin of the twenties with its famine and cold. No program, however good it is, will produce real results if we are unable to ensure the effectiveness of the executive. That is one of the most important immediate problems for stabilization today.

As for the disputes regarding the programs for the market switch, I would support the program elaborated under the guidance of academician Shatalin. Of course it has its weak points, and of course it can be criticized. It is, in effect, more of a concept at the moment that a real, detailed program. But it does contain the main element: It does take into consideration world experience in creating a market economy and the country's special features. It considers the republics' desire for state independence and provides an opportunity for this desire to be combined with the creation of a common market—a common economic space, to use economists' language.

That is our position. By no means everyone in Estonia shares this position as yet. As is well known, our republic—the only one of the 15, perhaps—did not participate in elaborating that program. Nevertheless meetings and discussions with scientists, economists, and leaders of enterprises and farms have shown that there are people in Estonia—and a considerable number at that—who support the idea of an economic union of sovereign states. Especially since many people realize that the Estonian national economy can scarcely exist without normal economic cooperation with the Union. The opinion is also being voiced, notably in the press, that it will hardly prove possible to strengthen the economy and stabilize the market by bilateral treaties between the republics alone.

What is in the way? Mistrust to some extent... Mistrust engendered by many decades of pressure, central diktat, failure to recognize the special features of the Baltic region, and reluctance to throughly investigate our problems. Mistrust which has not been dispelled over the last few years either...

Two years ago the idea of a Union treaty looked like a lifesaver for Estonia. It was, accordingly, also put forward by the Estonian Communist Party at the 19th all-Union party conference. But it met with no understanding or backing at that time... It took Lithuania's desperate step and the declarations of sovereignty adopted by a number of republics for the decision on the elaboration of a Union treaty to be adopted. But it is now in many respects seen as an attempt by the center to hold onto the republics at any price, as a new document enshrining their former status.

Why am I saying this? Time-wasting and procrastination cost us dearly. It is not for nothing that people say that a timely decision is a correct decision in politics. It is the same now with the Shatalin program. Delay in adopting a decision only increases tension and mistrust, gives rise to new disappointment, and speeds the processes of disintegration. At the same time constructive work based not merely on the desire to smooth the situation but, on the contrary, on a desire to take the republics' interests into consideration to the maximum and enable them to resolve their problems and determine the system of their relations with the union themselves could help matters. A rank-and-file Communist, an Estonian, voiced this idea very succinctly and simply at one of our party aktivs: "Let the Soviet Union be the kind of association of which Estonia would like to be part." Along with the other republics.

Nevertheless, as we can see, the idea of an economic union of sovereign states is having a difficult birth. It is greeted with suspicion and fear. Some people see it as a step toward the inevitable disintegration of the USSR. It is, after all, quite clear that the Union can no longer exist in its previous form, as a unitary state.

You can understand that many complex processes which have now begun so rapidly are worrying people, causing some to spontaneously reject everything that is new. It is hard to tell which is greater here: fear of a new, previously untrodden path, adherence to ideological stereotypes, or irresistible attraction to the comfortable past, which sometimes hides behind the slogan of "defending socialism." Although the very idea of socialism, for which which many people fearlessly endured death and suffering, represents the idea of freedom, equality, and opportunity for people rather than state leveling of their results and achievements.

In our republic all this is to a considerable extent connected with the Russian-speaking population's uncertainty and fear of being completely cut off from their country.

There have been many embittered disputes of late over what place the party should hold in all these processes. How we determine this depends on how we see the party's role in the new conditions.

I think that the party's task now is to enable commodity-money relations to develop freely. We have already seen what party direction of the market, supply, and demand looks like. And nothing good came of it. I think that the party should assume the role of stabilizer here. I would say that in general our main task now is to avert, neutralize, and prevent danger. That is, at any rate, how we see our role in our republic. This is a difficult, even thankless role. Particularly given that other parties, unburdened by the past, can put forward splendid, fine-sounding plans.

We are aware that the Communist Party bears responsibility for the economic and political crisis in the republic. But this does not mean that we have no moral right to oppose those steps that in our view aggravate this crisis still further, reduce living standards further, and produce manifestations of social injustice. We have opposed some of the government's steps of late. We deemed it necessary to point out its miscalculations and make our own suggestions.

The democratically elected soviets are now taking many decisions, including decisions that are not always well conceived and which are not tied up well enough with practice and life's realities. The problem is that many deputies as it were represent themselves in the soviets, with no sense of responsibility to the voters for the decisions that they adopt. We can indeed see this from the example of many of our soviets. But we do not think it right to enter into confrontation with the people's chosen representatives, the legislators, and increase the confrontation between the soviets and the party committees. I think that party organizations should act from below via the voters, and exert pressure on deputies that way.

We see this as one of the main avenues of party work now. Particularly in our republic, in Estonia, where we are the target of all attacks. What is more, there are attempts to divert people's attention away from the current difficulties, away from the steps that arouse a negative attitude in the population, away from, say, the drastic food price hikes in the republic by means of measures directed against the Communist Party. It is no accident that it has been announced now, a few days before the introduction of new meat, milk, bread, and butter prices, that the government has decided to hand over Estonian Communist Party Central Committee buildings to the republic.

Our party is alive all the same, and I believe that it will continue to be so. Representatives of all Estonia's rural districts and farm leaders gathered recently at our Central Committee. We had a long, thorough discussion. Estonian peasants are leisurely, reasonable, rational people. They are concerned not about outbursts of political passions but about down-to-earth concerns over grain, the harvest, how to prepare for the winter, and how to live when harder times set in. Their faith in the Communist Party has proved greater than their faith in other parties which loudly proclaim and consider that they express the interests of the countryside. This is a precious asset. Particularly in our situation, where the attitude to the Communist Party that has taken shape in the republic does not make membership of it or support for its positions easy or a source of prestige. Particularly for Estonians. If they remain members of it, if they continue to cooperate with it, they are people who have not lost their faith, people for whom certain ideas are important.

I think that our niche in sociopolitical life will be reinforced if we see our main function as being to show concern for people, if we proceed in our activity on the basis of the Estonian people's interests rather than the interests of our own existence as a party, if our principles remain selflessness rather than haste in the struggle for power, and if we display tolerance and readiness to cooperate with our political rivals rather than hatred of them. We think that the republic's Communists should determine their political position before doing this. We would like to avoid the formation of single-nationality communist parties in Estonia, especially since the republic already has single-nationality parties—that is, all the other parties apart from the Estonian Communist Party. We understand clearly that Estonians with their view of the situations and problems must remain within the Communist Party. We are relying on understanding rather than pressure and petty tutelage from the CPSU Central Committee in these difficult, painful processes of self-determination. It is, after all, necessary not only to view all these processes from the present position but also to ponder and predict how events will develop further and in what conditions the Communist Party will have to operate in the future.

Kolpakov Outlines Sector's Plight

PM1110155390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 Second Edition p 6

["Text" of speech delivered by S.V. Kolpakov, USSR minister of metallurgy, at the 9 October CPSU Central Committee Plenum session]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! Assessing the prevailing situation in the country, the Communists and in general the three million-strong collective of metallurgists support the idea of switching to market relations, although recently this has been severely complicated by the food shortages and the surge in prices. In our opinion, however, this transition should be made intelligently, with a clear idea of its further consequences for the immediate and longer-term condition of the state's economy. There is no doubt of the need to most speedily find specific mechanisms for switching to market relations. The lack of such mechanisms is the main shortcoming of practically all the programs under discussion. The choice of mechanism must be dictated primarily by the real situation prevailing in the country's economy.

A considerable amount has now been said about the mounting crisis phenomena in the economy. Unfortunately metallurgists are no exception in this regard. On the whole today the country's metallurgical complex is intact and in working order. I want to remind you that metal is the grain of industry. In speaking of metallurgy, I am also expressing concern at the state of affairs in industry as a whole. After metallurgists' steady work over the first four years of the five-year plan, this year's first nine months saw a decline in production of the main types of output nationwide of between two and five percent compared with last year. This is primarily because of unsatisfactory material and technical supplies to production. In the first nine months we failed to receive 6 million tonnes of ferrous and 130,000 tons of nonferrous scrap metal and over 5 million tonnes of coking coals. Many enterprises are leading a hand-to-mouth existence, which is leading to daily idle time for metallurgical units and to mishaps. As a result enterprises are approaching the winter season in a state of unreadiness.

I want to stress that the decline in output volumes is becoming a trend because of a whole series of exceptional circumstances—strikes, interethnic conflicts, a desire for sovereignty that is degenerating into primitive economic separatism, and a general decrease in discipline and manageability because of the decline in the prestige of authority and the virtual absence of it at local level. In our opinion, it is time to unite power in the soviets and executive committees at local level.

A system has emerged whereby, for instance, it is more profitable to conceal scrap needed by metallurgy, pay a fine of eight percent of its value to the procurement organizations, and then sell it to cooperatives at a price considerably exceeding the state price. Or to find a loophole to deliver it abroad. The Far Eastern ports are jammed with coal that metallurgy badly needs and they cannot ship it out in the quantities that are being supplied to foreign countries on the miners' initiative.

The deterioration in the work of the metallurgical complex is associated with the unstable situation in many regions where enterprises are located. Because of the connivance of local management organs, interethnic relations have become complicated. As a result a massive and intensive exodus of the Russian-speaking population, represented mostly by highly skilled workers and specialists, has begun. Look what is happening in Uzbekistan, including Almalyk, Tajikistan, Kirghizia, and the Tuva republic. And local soviets, as a rule, are slow to help enterprises.

Turnover among cadres of workers in the leading trades has increased sharply because metallurgical enterprises have lost their priority position with regard to labor remuneration. In the last few years metallurgy has slipped from second or third place to seventh place in terms of wage levels. Enterprises have not been able to compete regarding wages with cooperatives, which can use the overwhelming proportion of their income for labor remuneration. The departure of skilled workers from main production units with poor working conditions, particularly to go to cooperatives where they can earn two or three times as much for similar or easier work, has denuded many enterprises.

We demand that there be equal pay for equal work in the country. Despite the developing mixed economy in industry, we believe that the state sector is and will continue to be crucial in production, and these collectives should be the first to be considered.

The laws on taxing the labor remuneration fund adopted recently will exacerbate the situation. Unless enterprises receive real assistance in 1991-1992 to appreciably increase the consumption fund, there is every likelihood of the social complications mentioned by representatives of labor collectives at our union congress and the other trade union congresses that are being held in the country. Tremendous difficulties have arisen for metallurgists as a result of the sharp deterioration in capital construction. And we regard the situation in transport as an emergency. The demands of the transport workers unions for strikes in railroad transport simply cannot be allowed to be implemented. This would inevitably paralyze traffic.

The president's extremely necessary 27 September decree on urgent measures to stabilize economic ties in the fourth quarter and in the next year, if it is to become an effective regulator of economic life, must be backed up by a whole series of more specific decisions. Thus the coordination of the volumes of state orders, the need to preserve existing economic ties, and the problem of hard currency cost recovery need to be carefully examined among this complex of questions.

We are especially alarmed at the sharp differentiation among enterprises in terms of income levels that will emerge after the introduction of the new wholesale prices in 1991. This will mean that a huge number of enterprises that work in unfavorable conditions but are exceptionally important to the state will find themselves bankrupt. The bankruptcy of these enterprises, which is against the interests of the national economy, will be inevitable since the present system for redistributing financial resources within the sector is being abolished and no other decisions on this problem have yet been elaborated.

The crisis phenomena in metallurgy and the national economy as a whole will increase unless we very swiftly find and implement management structures and forms of ownership in which the demands of the market are taken into account. Our position on the question of switching metallurgy to the market economy is set out in the appeal to USSR President Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev published in PRAVDA for 24 September. The basis of this position is proposals for the swiftest possible transformation of the sector as a whole into state joint-stock companies—I emphasize, state companies. Some comrades here have been saying that joint-stock companies are almost the same thing as privatization. Precisely into state joint-stock companies, and the enterprises and organizations in the sector, which on a joint-stock basis will form associations and concerns and the entire joint-stock system, will have a single sectorial center—the ministry during the first stage of the formation of the market, and a metallurgy corporation thereafter.

Those who intend, deliberately or otherwise, to ruin more rapidly the country's economy are trying to pressure the government and public opinion with a demand for the elimination of ministries and glib talk of a change of names. We know what may result from these emotional decisions dictated by such approaches. Look at what the miners of the Donbass have come to. The management has been lost, volumes of coal extraction are constantly sliding, the economy is being ruined, and financial injections are no help. And today the miners are coming up to Mikhail Sergeyevich and saying: "Let us immediately restore the ministry, because we have taken the wrong course."

However, we envision fundamental perestroyka of production relations in the sector, with the departmental subordination of enterprises being replaced by ownership relations characteristic of a market economy. The structures of the metallurgical complex which we are proposing ensure the most important conditions for the market—the economic autonomy of enterprises, state enterprises, and relations between the various levels of the structure—and the norms of joint-stock law will be rigorously regulated.

Of course, the switch to the joint-stock form of economic management cannot fully solve the aforementioned problems. But it will create considerably broader opportunities for managing the situation. After the introduction into effect of the USSR president's decree "On Priority Measures To Switch to Market Relations" it is becoming urgently necessary to grant enterprises the right to apply to metal products contractual prices limited by a profitability ceiling. Otherwise metallurgy will be in an extremely grave position when other sectors are making extensive use of contractual prices, as envisaged in the decree. The question of establishing a norm for the sector for payments from the hard currency proceeds of exports of output also needs to be resolved.

This is exceptionally important for metallurgy, as a base sector with exceptionally high capital-intensiveness, a long investment cycle, and an extremely complex system of internal sector coproduction ties. The sectorial structure based on joint-stock relations will be geared to maximum end results while ensuring the specific interest of all elements of this structure.

Under the joint-stock structure production management is based on economic methods. At the same time the transition to the predominant use of these methods must, we believe, be implemented as a thoroughly organized and efficiently performed economic maneuver permitting a relatively painless transition to the system of coordinated decentralization proven by world economic experience.

Therefore we regard as timely and support the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision on additional powers for the USSR president and we ask Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to use these powers to overcome the increasingly evident desire of a number of republics to break the rational production ties prevailing in both our sector and other sectors by incorporating enterprises in artificial new formations at the republic level.

Many comrades have not fully understood, they are thinking only about the end results that they will have, but, comrades, you take a look at the sources, at the origins of the organization of the process and you will see what this will lead to. However, the problems of relations between the sector and the territory can be successfully solved within a system of joint-stock relations by appropriately dividing the shares and the income, as is done throughout the world, incidentally.

In the light of this the various "new models of economic accountability" in the republics seem artificial—they should be abolished. The Central Committee plenum must help the Communists of industrial enterprises to receive a faster answer to the questions that have been raised, for only then will primary party organizations be able to convince working people of the correctness of the chosen path and again give them a lead. There can be no more delay.

TASS Analyst Says CPSU 'In Deep Trouble'

LD1210083390 Moscow TASS in English 0821 GMT 12 Oct 90

[By TASS analyst Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—"Who's guilty?" And "what's to be done?"—the two questions that have preoccupied the Russian mind since time immemorial were again on every mind at the plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee held on October 8-9.

The country's largest political force is in deep trouble. Although still at the helm of a ship drifting towards a free-market, it seems unable to work out exactly how to get there.

In contrast to recent party forums, and this is a marked step forward, no one openly attacked the idea of a market economy. Instead, Communists debated the possible impact of the transition on the population.

Opinions were so diverse it occasionally seemed that the speakers belonged to different political parties.

However, the majority—radicals and conservatives alike—agreed that, given the current economic crisis and widespread anti- market sentiments, a plunge into a free market was likely to prove terminal.

While radicals tried to tackle problems the country would face during the transition, conservatives simply threatened the fatigue- battered Soviet consumer with a market. Traditional warnings of the danger of the "restoration of capitalism in the USSR" were all there.

Calls to set up a strong political centre which could implement the transition to a market were the only firm policy agreed upon by everybody.

Meanwhile, the opposite was happening: the centre was being rent asunder, according to Moscow party leader Yuriy Prokofyev.

Unless the tendency is stopped, the political autumn of 1990 will probably have to be compared not with 1921 (the year Vladimir Lenin introduced his ambitious New Economic Policy) but rather with 1918 (the outbreak of civil war in Russia).

In general terms, the plenum was productive. It reiterated the policy of the 28th Party Congress for the transition to a market and determined that Communists should work to stabilise the situation in society.

Even Communist Party critics understand now that perestroyka will not deliver without the Party's support.

The next months or maybe even weeks will show if the Communist Party itself is up to the task. The party's future and the fate of perestroyka depend on this.

Guseletov Says Plenum Fails To Address Crisis

PM1010143390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 p 1

[Interview with Boris Guseletov, coordinator of the "Young Communist" group and member of the CPSU Central Committee, by A. Voinov under the rubric: "Today's Interview": "What I Talked About at the Plenum"]

[Text] [Voinov] The CPSU Central Committee Plenum ended in Moscow yesterday. Boris Guseletov is assistant professor at the Sverdlovsk Engineering Training Institute, coordinator of the "Young Communist Group," and member of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Guseletov] In the main discussion at the plenum was about ways of switching to the market economy. But the discussion did, in my view, manage to avoid the extremes of both antimarket sentiments and full, unconditional "approval." In the end, plenum participants concluded that all the proposed reform programs need refining and proposed to the USSR president and CPSU Central Committee general secretary that a definitive version be created in the light of all the comments and speeches by communists.

The serious situation in the CPSU—the mass exodus from the party, and so forth—was raised as a question. The inactivity of the secretariat, the new politburo, and the general secretary of the CPSU since the 28th Congress was cited as a cause of this. The slack work of CPSU deputies in the USSR Supreme Soviet and other organs of power was particularly noted.

I also spoke in my speech about the crisis in the party. I consider that the proclaimed course of transforming the CPSU from a state organization into a political one has simply not begun to be implemented. And as a result plenum participants in their speeches again tried in the traditional manner to foist the solution of all our society's problems—economic, social, political, and so forth—onto the party

And as a political organization it should now select just a few "areas of main thrust." One of them—a very important one, in my view—is youth policy. And that needs above all a clearly-defined action program. First, legislative initiative is needed (the immediate adoption of a whole range of laws on youth).

Second, we need the creation of state and social structures to provide social protection for the young. Third, we need real CPSU involvement in specific youth programs. And, finally, to implement all this we need to trust young people themselves.

However, my speech found no particular understanding or support in the hall. And that is a pity, because it is our future that is at stake.

Pamyat Leader Sentenced to 2 Years Imprisonment

LD1210101990 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—The Moscow City court today sentenced Konstantin Smirnov-Ostashvili, one of the leaders of the Pamyat Society, to two years imprisonment for inciting ethnic hatred.

Smirnov-Ostashvili, 54, a worker, was one of the organisers of a row staged at the Moscow House of Writers in January this year.

He will serve his term in a colony with reinforced regime.

Oleynik, Political Parties Discuss Union Treaty

LD1110104190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 11 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today for the first time a representative of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Boris Oleynik, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is meeting the country's political parties. They are to discuss the Union Treaty.

Gorbachev Views Reform Process

91UN0037A Kiev KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA in Russian 23 Sep 90 p 4

[Report on interview with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev by unidentified KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA correspondent at the USSR Supreme Soviet; date not given: "USSR President M.S. Gorbachev Gives an Interview to KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA"]

[Text] These days the president can often be found in the hall of our parliament. When there is discussion of paths to the country's economic development, our president is constantly in the Supreme Soviet. And during the breaks, he is actively engaged in contacts with lawmakers and journalists as well. We could not pass up such an opportunity.

[Gorbachev] One thing worries me right now—we are really short on time. The way trends toward disintegration are growing, it is going to be very difficult to gather up all the stones. We must act. We need a program. We must do everything in our power to get a mechanism in place for implementing this program. I told Democrat Travkin: All political streams must come together right now. When all is said, we do have a definite political culture being formed at present. But it is not yet complete, and this is causing all our problems. The next elections will be held from party lists—the leaders are already determined. The important thing is not to forget about our native land as we move to genuine pluralism. What our society will be like 30-100 years from now depends on what decisions we make during these days—regarding the market, and regarding the Union. And the fact that some people try to intimidate me is not so terribly frightening. You can even go looking for St. Helena Island number two if you like.

[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA] Generally speaking, are you in favor of profound changes?

[Gorbachev] Absolutely. But I am very much afraid of alarmists. People often tell me—we need decisiveness, decisiveness... Do you know what decisiveness is? It is retaining our Union. But banging someone over the head—can this be decisiveness? This we have been able to do. I did it solidly for nine years. I too am from there, from that world, and do not want it any more. If all of that had not happened, the necessity would hardly have arisen for me to change my own outlook and realign other aspects. The only thing is—our society is still lacking in morality and culture. We need to combine the mechanism for executing the laws with the market economy, with freedom of the individual.

[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA] What do you think today about Shatalin's program? When will this be discussed in the parliament?

[Gorbachev] It is not above reproach. But we need not demand that a program lay everything out for us. We simply must choose the proper direction and proceed. People often reproach Gorbachev—he opposes the failure to provide reference points [sentence as published]. What, shall we use a stick to whip people into a good life? What kind of a good life can it be if you have to whip people into it? Now choosing the right direction—indeed, we cannot make a mistake here. But even if we choose it, and do not err in this—we will all experience further toil and sweat, times will be hard. But we must understand that this is necessary. Perhaps this is exactly the variant which was talked about some time ago—convergence, the ideas of bourgeois philosophers, etc. But I will not consider it unfavorable if we join to our socialized economy and to our society private initiative and private interest. In fact if we succeed in this, it will be a true revolution indeed. And private interest is far from the primitive concept of "private operator." Socialists have not as yet succeeded in uniting private interest with socialism. Our privatization lies within the framework of our option. There it is—the plant. There you see its owners, leaseholders, and so forth. Freedom of the individual is the important thing, and the people's wealth should fall to the people.

[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA] Some people are saying today that during the process of transition to the market the country will lose its academic science, and that it will therefore be doomed to a long period of lagging behind. What do you think about this?

[Gorbachev] If during the transition period we tear our science apart, then we will ruin everything. But the fact that they are crying and yelling about things in every republic—this does not influence me. Doesn't India have a market? But how do they live? Take a look. Or let me name a hundred other countries—and how do they live? It just does not help. Why? Because you need a market, and initiative, but you have to combine all of this with scientific- technological progress and the achievements of science. God forbid we bury this science. We must allow our tremendous potential to open up. We must unite scientific creativity with economic freedom. But we should not be beating up on one another. Only those who are violent must be isolated—all the rest are our people. On the right, and on the left—all are our people and they want what is best.

[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA] Not long ago you met with Ronald Reagan, who just a few years ago said that the Kremlin was the center of the evil empire...

[Gorbachev] Now you know that Mr. Reagan has long since repudiated this. We very recently got together in the American Embassy and reminisced about a great deal. And do you know what we talked about? About the fact that we had laid the bricks under what is going on today in our relations and relations with all countries. History apparently so ordered that a new leadership of the Soviet Union in 1985 would have at its disposal a powerful credit of confidence, and the American President then would enter a new term and enjoy great authority and prestige. This provided the opportunity for taking the most difficult initial steps. Here people say—chance, chance... But such a conflux of circumstances enabled movement forward. Once relations between these giants began to change, changes took place in the world.

[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA] What does the Kremlin mean to you?

[Gorbachev] It is our history, it is what is most important in each of us. It is our destiny, and it is therefore a sacred place.

[KOMSOMOLSKOYE ZNAMYA] And therefore the center of the new political system?

[Gorbachev] A good center. Here is where it should be. In my opinion, it must not be moved anywhere else.

Adviser Defends Special Powers for Gorbachev

AU1110144090 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 11 Oct 90 p 3

[Report by Ernst Sittinger: "Against Speculators and Mafiosi"]

[Text] Graz—On the sidelines of the "Styrian Academy," Kirghiz author and close adviser of Soviet President Gorbachev, Chingiz Aitmatov, expressed optimism about the continued existence of the Soviet Union. In reality, the only objective of the increasing drawing together of the Asiatic steppe republics, which are reportedly planning to form a central Asiatic federation, is closer economic contacts, Aitmatov told DER STANDARD.

The point is now to preserve Gorbachev's latest special powers. According to Aitmatov, these additional powers apply to all measures required for the renewal of the Soviet economy. The general democratization process is currently endangered by certain circles of "speculators, profiteers, and mafiosi," against whom tough measures must be taken. This is the reason for the special powers and justifies them. In the future, Gorbachev's role should be exactly the same as at the moment. Of course, this will lead to a position that is as strong as possible, he said.

Aitmatov compared the future relations between the Soviet peoples with the coexistence within a family. Traditional values have to be revived in the union and in the family. "There are strong political currents that work on the loosening of the structures. This is a difficult time for the family."

The author literally warned against "too many excuses for letting the family down." The general uprooting results in many dangers which finally might become the problem of the entire society: "In this question all people must be conservative. There are things that must not be renewed."

Sixty-two-year-old Aitmatov, who deals with the structure of small peasantry in old Kirghizia in his most famous novel entitled "Dzhamilya," is a member of the Soviet Presidential Council. This is a primarily consultative body which gives comprehensive information and recommendations to the president. The progressive political forces are "undoubtedly" the majority in the council, he said.

In answer to the question whether the president observes the recommendations: "Yes, in a way our view is taken into account. After all, Gorbachev chose people whose opinion is important to him."

Aitmatov is regarded as nonconformist and critical, but he was awarded the Lenin Order in 1963. This is a "fact that is also of historical importance for me," he said. He personally does not want "to overrate or underrate" Lenin.

Papers Respond To Investigation Into Article

PRAVDA Denies Request for Source

PM0710154190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Commentary by Yu. Makhrin, member of the USSR Union of Journalists Auditing Commission, on a letter from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, followed by an editorial note, carried under the rubric "We Continue a Topic": "As in the 'Good' Old Days"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] On 3 October PRAVDA received the following document, addressed to its chief editor, from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet:

We inform you that a deputies' commission to investigate articles carried in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on the preparation of a coup d'etat has been set up by decision of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media and Relations with Public Organizations. The commission requires that the following information be made available to it.

1. When and from where was the text of "Action Program-90" obtained by the editorial office?

2. Who made the decision to publish V. Petrunya's article "Who Needs Rotting Potatoes?" in PRAVDA?

3. Did the editorial office check the reliability of the information set out in the article?

4. Who coordinated the publication of the articles by V. Petrunya first in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (20 September 90) and then in PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (2 October 90), and how was this done?

5. What is the explanation for an article on "Action Program-90," which was adopted at the end of July, appearing in the CPSU Central Committee central organ at the end of September 1990?

6. Why do the newspaper articles lack the details about the authors of the program set out at the end of the document (paragraph 32), which would have enabled readers and the editorial office to easily determine its true authorship?

7. We ask that this information be presented to us by 8 October 1990.

[Signed] Yu.M. Luchinskiy, chairman of the commission and deputy chairman of the mass media committee.

On reading this verdict I could not help recalling the first lines of the recent "USSR Law on the Press and Other Mass Media," which say that they are free. For how many years did journalists in this country seek to achieve that? And it was journalists rather than legislators! Exercising the right of legislative initiative, the USSR Journalists Union asked the legislators to adopt a law guaranteeing freedom of expression. The work on the document was long and agonizingly hard. But at last it was born, and press workers breathed a sigh of relief. And how! The burden of total censorship had brutally crushed journalists.

But let us return to the document, in which the "democratic" visage of the censor insolently seeks to oppress the newspaper through the supreme power of Russia. Judging by its tone and the way the questions are formulated, Russian legislator Yu.M. Luchinskiy thinks that the law is not written for him: If I want something, I make intimidatory noises. If only he had remembered that the paramountcy of the law has been proclaimed in our state and that it wants to be a rule-of-law state, he would certainly have gone back to the Law on the Press. Let us acquaint the chairman of the commission and deputy chairman of the committee on the mass media with it.

Where did the newspaper editorial office get the text of "Action Program-90?" Excuse me but, you know, Article 28 of the Law on the Press reads: "The editorial office, the mass media, and the journalist do not have the right:

"1. To name a person who has supplied information on condition that his name is not divulged, except in cases where a court demands it..." As you can see, this refers solely to a court; there is no mention of a legislator here.

But was there ever really a body, so to speak? Yes, there was! PRAVDA reported this on 28 September in the article "What the 'Democrats' Are Preparing." (I apologize to readers for having to quote from my own article). "Incidentally, a reasonable idea (unfortunately, it did not form part of the account published on 26 September, but it does figure in the minutes) was put forward during the roundtable meeting with representatives of sociopolitical parties and movements held in PRAVDA's editorial office." Let us quote: "A Russian Democratic Forum document has been read out here. But why is there no expert legal report on the document today? After all, it does contain (this is clear even to me, a nonlawyer) individual elements which call for the forcible overthrow of particular sociopolitical, state, and other structures. Why cannot we, then, as a united bloc speak out against such actions by individual political structures and groups, as is done in a civilized state?" I consider that a reasonable and timely proposal! USSR people's deputies and their colleagues in other organs of Soviet power could carry out such an analysis so as to understand and be able to explain to the electorate what certain Russian "democrats" are preparing.

Who made the decision to publish V. Petrunya's article "Who Needs Rotting Potatoes?"? Esteemed legislator, turn to PRAVDA's publication details, where it is written in black and white: chief editor, editorial collegium...

Did the editorial office check the reliability of the information presented in the article? We wish to draw the legislator's attention to the following: V. Petrunya's article was published on 26 September under the major subhead "TASS Observer's Opinion." TASS—that is to say, the Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union. Incidentally, the same issue of PRAVDA carried articles from other news agencies —INTERFAX, REUTER, YONHAP... Here's what the the Law on the Press says: "The editor (chief editor)... does not bear responsibility for the dissemination of... information obtained from news agencies or the press services of state and public organs."

So all Yu.M. Luchinskiy's subsequent questions are addressed to the wrong quarter.

Furthermore, IZVESTIYA on 4 October carried a report that Aleksandr Chernyak, executive secretary of PRAVDA's editorial office, was a member of the commission investigating Petrunya's articles. Chernyak learned of this—to his extreme amazement—only on reading the report. No one had talked to him or asked his agreement. However, he cannot take part in the commission and violate the Law on the Press.

The suppressors of press freedom from Stalinist times, and even more so those of the era of stagnation, would burst with envy to hear about the RSFSR Supreme Soviet directive: "The Russian legislators have outdone us!" While my journalist colleagues will hold their heads and say: The censor is alive and well! A censor dressed in the full regalia of a legislator?! What could be more absurd. What kind of a democrat is that!

From the editorial office

Yesterday members of the Russian Democratic Forum (RDF) council of representatives and representatives of political parties and organizations belonging to the RDF held a news conference in Moscow on the sensational "Action Program-90." The RDF leaders continue to regard their program as the optimal program for extricating society from crisis. At the same time they note that not all democratic movements share their program.

Detailed comment on the news conference will be published in PRAVDA.

TASS, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Respond

PM0710183390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Commentary by TASS Deputy General Director V. Talanov on RSFSR Supreme Soviet commission letter, plus editorial comment: "What Are We Investigating: Regarding a Deputies' Commission Inquiry"]

[Text] On the evening of 3 October the TASS leadership received a letter through official channels. It reads as follows:

"We inform you that a deputies' commission to investigate articles carried in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on the preparation of a coup d'etat has been set up by decision of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media and Relations with Public Organizations.

"The commission requires that the following information be made available to it:

"1. When and from where was the text of 'Action Program-90' obtained by TASS?

"2. What is TASS' relation to the publication of the article 'Who Needs Rotting Potatoes?' by its observer, V.

Petrunya? Did the agency check the reliability of the information set out in the article?

"3. Who coordinated the publication of the articles by TASS observer V. Petrunya first in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (20 September 90) and then in PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (2 October 90), and how was this done?

"4. What is the explanation for an article on 'Action Program-90,' which was adopted at the end of July, appearing in central party newspapers at the end of September 1990?

"5. Has V. Petrunya's article been published in local newspapers? If so, which?

"We ask that this information be presented to us by 8 October 1990.

"[Signed] Yu.M. Luchinskiy, chairman of the commission and deputy chairman of the mass media committee."

It is a good thing, of course, that deputies' commissions are being set up. Including investigative commissions. It is somewhat strange, however, that it is "investigation of articles." Are these perhaps Russian articles and on republic problems? No, the esteemed commission has seen in the aforementioned articles the problem of "of a coup d'etat under preparation" in the country. But that indeed, as one says, is a matter of interpretation.

If the commission members really think that the honor of the "Russian Democratic Forum" organization, which calls for the violent overthrow of the authorities, is offended in the articles, does it not occur to them that the first to be overthrown will be... themselves? However, this may be a question of predilection and sympathy.

Regarding the interest in where the text of "Action Program-90" was obtained from, we wish to inform the deputy chairman of the mass media committee that the USSR Law on the Press and Other Mass Media was recently adopted. Under Article 28 of the Law TASS, like any other press organ, is not reguired to disclose sources of information. The law is the law, as the saying goes. And it must be respected.

Moreover, if Deputy Luchinskiy had indeed really wanted to get the text of the extremist document, he could have done so... and without making any inquiry: Judging by question 4 of the letter, he has the "Program" in his possession. He would be able to see for himself at the same time the reliability of the article by checking the quotations cited in it with the text of the "Program."

Every journalist is certainly familiar with the technology used to transmit TASS reports to subscribers. If this is unknown to the leader of the republic mass media committee, you are always welcome at the agency: We will introduce you to the journalists who prepare the reports and also with the technology which "coordinates" the simultaneous transmission of reports to hundreds of subscribers via VDU's and telex.

In answer to question 2 of the letter, it can be reported that V. Petrunya is entitled as a journalist to express his standpoint not just within TASS but outside it. That is provided for by the Law on the Press and also forms part of glasnost, to which we are committed.

Incidentally, if the commission is an "investigative" commission, it can obviously establish for itself which local republic papers, exercising their customer's right, publish which TASS reports, commentaries, and reportage, and in what form.

And finally why, as the commision chairman sees it, did articles about the extremist "Action Program" appear with a patent time lag? Here I want to ask Esteemed Luchinskiy a question: How do you explain that, as emerged at the session, deputies obtained this document long ago while the deputy chairman of the mass media committee did not acquaint journalists with it?

Perhaps the deputies of the Russian legislature have instructed the commission to investigate the substance of the problems broached in the articles? Or does the question of who allowed them, who dared, actually interest them? We have already "experienced" this formulation of a question in the recent past.

At the same time we inform you that your request for submission of the information of interest by 8 October has been met ahead of time. And as befits the era of glasnost—via the mass media.

[Signed] V. Talanov, deputy general director of TASS
5 October 1990

Postscript

It is difficult to add anything to the aforementioned. But Commision Chairman Luchinskiy does also require that our editorial office supply evidence.

1. When and where was the text of "Action Program-90" obtained by the editorial office?

—The text was obtained from readers. They also inform us that the program is being published in local mass media.

2. Who made the decision to publish TASS observer V. Petrunya's article "Who Needs Rotting Potatoes?" in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA?

—The decision to publish the TASS article was made, as is usual, by the person in charge of publishing that issue.

3. Did the editorial office check the reliability of the information in the aforementioned article and in the article by E. Volodin "Where the Echelon of Newcomers Can Be Expected to Come From" (21 October 90)?

—The factual basis of the articles by V. Petrunya and E. Volodin is fully in accord with the provisions of "Action Program-90."

4. Who coordinated the publication of V. Petrunya's articles in PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (26 September 90) and how was this done?

—The question is not altogether clear. Can the newsroom's agency telex machines, which supply the editorial office with information, really be considered as the "coordinator"?

5. What is the explanation for an article on "Action Program-90," which was adopted at the end of July, appearing in our newspaper at the end of September 1990?

—Readers sent us "Action Progam-90" too late. It would have been better, of course, if they had sent it at the end of July.

6. Why do the newspaper articles lack the details about the authors of the program set out in paragraph 32 of the document, which would have enabled readers and the editorial office to easily determine its true authorship?

—We deemed it impossible to disseminate information which, in our view, should interest first and foremost the Constitutional Oversight Committee or, say, a commission of investigation.

Article's Author Views Response

PM0310123190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS observer Vladimir Petrunya article under the rubric "Political Passions Over an Article": "First Let's Harvest Potatoes, Maybe?"]

[Text] A surprising thing: The smell of printer's ink had not had time to fade from the pages of the newspapers which published the commentary "Who Needs Rotting Potatoes," before many of those who had immediately publicly disowned the extremist "Action Program-90" aimed at the forcible seizure of power in the country suddenly and unexpectedly began to come out... in defense of that manifesto.

The reaction of M. Poltoranin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic minister for the press and mass information, was one of prompt displeasure: How could they dare to "highlight" the document? Who allowed it? The minister, in the past an active propagandist for the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and a graduate of Alma-Ata Higher Party School, reached this conclusion: These are none other than the machinations of "Staraya Square" [address of Moscow CPSU City Committee].

All this could be ascribed to the personal qualities of the minister, who was recently appealing from television screens for reprisals against those journalist colleagues of his (and members of their families) who are still working in the party press (where, incidentally, M. Poltoranin himself worked meticulously almost all his life), if it were not for one circumstance. The "Action Program" contains a direct instruction to the "independent" mass media not to sit things out in the trenches and not to stay silent.

However, the minister was not alone in obeying the "command of his heart." Had he been alone, it would not be worth writing about this. Yet on the same day as the minister was organizing a "witch hunt" at the interregionals' news conference, a meeting of the "independent" press was being held in another hall—in the House of Journalists—at which this task was set: It is necessary to react.

React to what? To the fact that the "honor" of the extremists calling, for example, for the dispersal of collective and state farms and, at the same time, of the Congress of People's Deputies has been wounded? Then why, one wonders, take such a pained view of those who, as my IZVESTIYA colleague V. Vyzhutovich maintains, are certainly not legion but just a handful? A handful of extremists? But see with what partiality and coordination, day after day, a group of journalists on All-Union Radio defends this extremist program, sparing neither labels nor words of abuse against those who have dared to write about it... Is it, thus, not just the program of a handful?

I thank my colleague for developing the theme further (IZVESTIYA No. 272), for familiarizing me a little with the "Russian Democratic Forum" organization itself, and for distinguishing it from "Democratic Russia."

But this is what is strange—although he distinguished it, he did not venture to cite the "Action Program" in this regard. However, there, in what may be its most troublesome section, it is by no means a distinguishing feature that is denoted in black and white: "To protest to those figures in the Moscow voters association and the 'Democratic Russia' block (and we all belong to these organizations) who, not disdaining overt demagoguery and slander, seek to establish their monopoly in Russia's democratic movement..."

I will not venture to judge which of the "democrats" displays a "neo-Bolshevist syndrome," as stated in the "program"—it is probably easier for my IZVESTIYA colleague to get to the bottom of this. I express full solidarity with him on one point—in our uncontrollable circumstances we really must not create an enemy image and fire propaganda guns loaded in advance with a charge of labels and threats. But the unique "briefing" of independent, people's, democratic mass media has convinced me that such charges have been prepared and resound tirelessly on the propaganda battlefield.

None other than USSR People's Deputy G. Starovoytova has urged her associates in the press to engage in physical violence against dissidents. No, of course, the people's deputy herself will not allow a bludgeon to be raised against political opponents. But she explained to the men in simple Aesopian language: The "democrats" once gave quite a drubbing to some dissenter, and this, in the opinion of the people's deputy, is "humane." So you independents, she says, must also know what stand to take in such cases.

My God, what is happening to us, what are we calling for, where are we going? Maybe it is, in fact, time to calm down, to ponder, to grow wiser? To acknowledge the law as the law, and common sense as the most important social priority. And then: Since such passions have flared up over the "Action Program-90," would it not be better to publish it in its entirety—from the first to the last page—in the press which is controlled by no one? In IZVESTIYA, for example. The reader will understand for himself why the word "democrats" is not enclosed there within any suspicious quotation marks. And again—to show who is behind the "program."

To make everything entirely clear, let the truly democratic, i.e. people's-power, movements and organizations express their attitude toward it. Without any quotation marks. Then it will be possible to wage political battles on a mutually respectful basis.

But first it is necessary to harvest potatoes. For they are rotting...

Popov Discusses Economic Perestroyka

PM1110132090 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 9 Oct 90 p 8

[Interview with Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov by Betty Giuliani in Milan; date not given]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Giuliani] What do you—as mayor of Moscow, a former economics teacher, and leading figure in the Soviet Union's democratic movement—think about perestroyka? How is the great renewal proceeding?

[Popov] Real perestroyka has not yet started in the economic field. Basically, we are discussing plans to achieve it. On the political front, however, the difficulties are even greater. We are grappling with the conflicts between the new tendencies and the old ideas about the economy. Conservative-type plans do not satisfy people who have obtained the right to express themselves freely, to protest, but who do not yet have the possibility or the right to resolve the chiefly economic problems themselves.

[Giuliani] What is your opinion, both as an economist and as a politician, concerning the economic plans recently presented to the Supreme Soviet by Shatalin and Ryzhkov?

[Popov] My opinions from both viewpoints in this regard coincide. The plan submitted by Ryzhkov is not a perestroyka plan. It only promises a renewal, but in fact reintroduces the old, traditional economic systems. Price increases—inevitable when you move to a market economy—should be determined by the market and not from above. It is the government that must establish new prices, on the basis of its own needs. [sentence as published] In other words, it is a traditional-type state regulation. Furthermore, we cannot allow prices to be determined exclusively by market forces, because there would be excessively rapid inflation; prices would rocket. The proper compromise lies in the proposal made by Shatalin, Gorbachev, and Yeltsin, whereby the state should intervene to regulate prices only of essential goods, allowing other products to be sold at free prices. The state would perform a price-controlling role, but only with respect to essential goods. So whoever takes over a factory or some commercial activity will have to be able to set the prices of a large proportion of the output, otherwise what point would there be in becoming the owner of an enterprise? This is why, even though the Ryzhkov plan does envisage the possibility of privatization, in fact it does not make its implementation possible. On 15 October Gorbachev is due to present the new economic plan; then we shall see which "version" is backed—that of the apparatus, or the democratic one.

[Giuliani] In your address to the Milan conference you spoke of a very uncertain and constantly evolving political situation, of the possibility of a new government in the next two months. Would you care to clarify your remarks?

[Popov] Hitherto our country has been led by a center coalition represented by Gorbachev and conservative forces that I call "center-left." The Ryzhkov plan reflects precisely the interests of this coalition, which I believe should be replaced by another, "center-right" coalition, represented by Gorbachev together with radical forces. This new coalition would be characterized by the fact that it would be up to the local republican bodies to make the decisions. In other words, a decentralization, which would bring about a new kind of central government, renewed not so much with respect to its composition as with respect to the functions that it will be called on to perform. For instance, there would no longer be a ministry of agriculture or machine building entrusted exclusively to central government, but local ministries, whose functions would be delegated to the local republican bodies. From this viewpoint, foreign trade activities, too, would no longer be the responsibility of central government but would be extended to the whole country. This is why I maintain that when we talk about credits and trade relations with other countries it is right and natural for these relations to be conducted while involving also the people who will in future make the decisions in this regard, namely, the republics and local administrations, giving priority to the factories that will become independent, that is, private.

[Giuliani] With regard to the Gulf crisis, how do you judge the situation following the Helsinki accords?

[Popov] We did not all realize what was happening. We imagined, too simplistically, that the accord reached between the United States and the Soviet Union would eliminate international tensions. The lesson taught to us by the crisis that has exploded in the Gulf is that there is a much more complex and multifaceted problem than that of removing the tanks from Berlin.

[Giuliani] What prospects does the situation in Moscow afford for the near future?

[Popov] It is much more difficult than in any other part of the country; there are major problems concerning food, and if there is a severe winter,other problems will join the existing ones.

Police Handling of Omsk Rally Criticized

PM1210102590 Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Oct 90 p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Petrov: "Exceeding Authority—Facts and Consequences"]

[Text] The overstepping of authority in an attempt to prevent the Democratic Union's unsanctioned rally on Omsk's Lenin Square on Constitution Day brought unexpected consequences. Two representatives of the organization staged a protest hunger strike at the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] building. Homemade banners demanded the resignation of the city and local internal affairs administration leadership.

What exactly happened? It was already the third rally planned on Lenin Square by supporters of Democratic Union and other organizations to be banned, because a large gathering of people there paralyzes the city's traffic. Let us add that the two previous meetings had been held despite the ban.

The day before, the Democratic Union members had seemed to accept the ban when they received it. But in view of past experience the authorities prepared themselves for more resolute action in case there was another violation. Reinforced militia details prevented demonstrators from breaking the gorispolkom decision for a third time. No one saw any slogans, banners, or placards at the Lenin Monument, although quite a few people were gathered in the vicinity. Democratic Union members were carrying out a sociological survey, and people had only to walk a few dozen paces to the rally location.

And there something unexpected occurred: Clearly overstepping their authority, the organs of law and order began grabbing and throwing into "paddy wagons" everyone who stopped on the square even for a short while. Not just passersby, but even a deputy of the oblast soviet and a press photographer ended up at the Kuybyshev Rayon Department. Other representatives of the press also received rude, off-hand treatment.

Yes, mass events do demand order. But the law is written not just for those who attend rallies but also for those who are to keep the law. When they exceed their authority the guardians of law and order not only heat up a situation but also put trump cards into the hands of the opposition, who will not hesitate to use them. In this case it resulted in a hunger strike. Moreover, Democratic Union supporters have based themselves in the gorispolkom reception area, where they are collecting signatures for their demands.

It would be perfectly lawful to exercise authority there. But the city leadership now hesitates and is fearful—this is yet another lamentable result of the excessive authority wielded the day before.

Arbat Rally Called 'Insulting,' 'Hysterical'

PM1010132990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Major G. Dmitriyev under the rubric: "Direct Line": "The Different Ways People Understand Awareness"]

[Text] Moscow—Last Sunday could scarcely be unreservedly called a day of rest for Muscovites, or for the population of other cities and villages for that matter. Thousands of the capital's inhabitants and servicemen from the garrison worked in the fields around Moscow. Only a few days remain for the potatoes to be laid in, and the quantity heaped up in the storehouses is still clearly falling short of the demand—which naturally cannot fail to cause concern among the people. And what about preparing the municipal services, and particularly the heat supply systems, for the winter? Here too, as is known, there work can be found for those who want to display their activeness.

But apparently even these harsh realities of our times, to put it bluntly, are not able to stop the activists who recognize no other way of resolving tasks apart from through strikes, rallies, and demonstrations.... This was shown once again by the occurrence on Arbat Square outside the USSR Defense Ministry 7 October. Around 200 people gathered here in response to an appeal circulated by members of the Transnational Radical Party, the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists, and the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers. Among the speakers were representatives of the above-mentioned organizations and other movements and groupings. One of them "introduced himself," for example, as an "ordinary Moscow hippie." It seems that many other people who were not burdened with any concern about their appearance, to put it mildly, came here quite simply in order to behave like hippies.

But was it fitting to pass verdicts on such serious questions in the street? The speeches included demands to implement alternative civilian service and other demands, including some connected with the fall draft. The flagrant anti-Army orientation of the speeches, and the insulting and at times even hysterical nature of many of them, as well as the previously prepared placards and the concerted chanting of slogans—all this bore witness to the participation of experienced "conductors" in this action, who are pursuing quite specific aims that are far removed from a desire to resolve problems of Army life constructively within the channels of legality and order. These "conductors'" desire to speculate on the grief of mothers who have lost their sons, which has already been noted in the press, is in no doubt either.

One of the speakers, who called himself a representative of "Rukh," was clearly disillusioned with the small number of people present, and reproached Muscovites with a lack of "awareness." But maybe the opposite is true—people are starting to discern the true intentions of those who call them again and again to rallies under the "Down with!" slogan.

Railways Minister Opposes Planned Strike

LD1110175790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] As we have already reported, delegates to the railwaymen's trade union congress have decided to stage a strike on 15 October. We have asked Nikolay Semenovich Konarev, the USSR railways minister, to comment on this.

[Begin Konarev recording] Yesterday, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, held a joint meeting with leading officials of the Ministry and the Transport Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet to discuss the questions raised by delegates to the 25th trade union congress. It has to be bluntly stated that these decisions greatly alarmed everyone. After all, what does a railway strike mean? As far as the economic damage is concerned, a day's strike means a three billion rubles [R] loss for the country as a whole, and a R346 million loss for the transport industry. Therefore, I really do appeal—and not just to the railwaymen and members of their families, but to the entire Soviet people—for these attempts to be rejected.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers examined all the questions and made decisions, which to all intents and purposes remove all the grounds which were put forward. First and foremost, I would like to inform you that a program for the technical reequipping and modernization of the railways during 1991-2000 has been endorsed. The chairman of the government asked the Supreme Soviet to speed up the examination and adoption of a law on railway transport at the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This envisages the introduction of a whole series of decisions which will benefit railway workers and protect their interests.

After examining this question, the Supreme Soviet commission recommended that the rules should be replaced by a regulation on discipline. In doing so it was aware of the fact that the railways cannot work without discipline. This is an industry with a high degree of responsibility and danger. Therefore, the industry cannot simply be left without a guiding, organizing document like the Rules which it has had up to now. Therefore, it was decided that when the law is adopted, the transport industry will be governed by a regulation on discipline, which will regulate the activities of people and their responsibility for work which does not match up to a whole series of standards, such as transport safety, the safekeeping of goods, and a number of other requirements.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers appealed to the railwaymen to display a high level of loyalty to the state's interests during this period and not to allow strikes, because these actions are illegal and because the demands which they have put forward have been resolved by this decision. [end recording]

CPSU Defends October Celebration

PM1010084990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by I. Prelovskaya: "Should We Abandon the Holiday?"]

[Text] On Friday morning newspapers published the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat statement "On the 73d Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution."

As is well known, there have been calls in some cities and regions of the country for the 7 November holiday—a date which has throughout our state's history been solemnly celebrated as the day of its birth, the country's major holiday—to be abandoned.

"National holidays throughout the world," the statement says, "are inseparable from the concepts of statehood, civic dignity, and the people's patriotic, historical, and cultural traditions. October has for a long time now been more than just a Soviet celebration. It has quite justifiably become a holiday for everyone who believes in the creative potential of the socialist idea, which has become a panhuman value."

"Leninist tradition prompts us to conduct jubilee celebrations by mobilizing and uniting popular forces. This task of nationwide, interethnic consolidation is particularly important now that our society is moving on to profound economic reforms and to the conclusion of a new union treaty." Further: "Its moral purpose today involves taking an active part in resolving pressing problems, comprehending the past, and paying due tribute to the generations who created it before us."

Various memories are connected with the 7 November holiday in our country. Older people remember the parade on Red Square—from where the soldiers left for battle—in the fateful year of 1941, producing great hope in everyone's heart. There was both joy and merrymaking on that holiday. But there was also false pomposity and the beginning of the ingrained but wearisome habit of coming along to the compulsory demonstrations with portraits of numerous party leaders whom few people effectively knew. Over the years the monotony of the holiday became truly depressing. Nevertheless, are not some people in too much of a hurry to do away with traditions at a stroke? After all, this has already happened in the past—from the destruction of monuments and the renaming of cities and streets to the cancellation of holidays dating back many centuries. Should we rush to renounce our own history? We could not help being struck by the contradiction when, on the one hand, a call was heard in Moscow not to celebrate 7 November because our lives are hard now and, on the other, a short while later City Day was celebrated—three days of celebrations, incidentally. If we have finally recognized dissent today, thank goodness, can we deny a significant proportion of the people the opportunity at least to celebrate their holiday? Who in fact has the right to decide this for the whole people today?

The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat statement says: "We are not calling for ostentatious ballyhoo and empty eulogies. We urge you to preserve the vital soul of the November celebration—its unifying thrust, humanity, and spirit of solidarity and internationalism." But the forms of celebrating the holiday may change—there may be ceremonial meetings, demonstrations, rallies, and other events. You are bound to agree that this is sensible. Are we afraid of dissension during the festive time? Public opinion must counter it. Is it fitting to spoil the mood of those who celebrate and value it?

KGB Opens Intelligence Museum

LD1110034290 Moscow TASS in English 2030 GMT 10 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Borisov and Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow October 10 TASS—Documents, weapons, foreign spying equipment and KGB officers' personal belongings and awards are among some 2,000 items exhibited at Chekistskiy Hall at the KGB Headquarters in Moscow. Journalists were for the first time able to visit the hall today.

Until recently, only KGB officers could visit the hall, which is now open to public groups.

Today's meeting with the press was designed to show that "Serious, irreversible changes in line with perestroyka are under way in the KGB, and dispel the bias towards KGB activities", KGB spokesman Vladimir Maslennikov said.

Genuine restructuring began in the KGB after Yuriy Andropov was appointed the agency's chief, Maslennikov said.

Journalists' attention was drawn to a quotation from CIA Director William Webster's speech on December 11, 1988, who said that "Glasnost and democratisation in the Soviet Union provide unprecedented opportunities for the CIA in gathering information by overt and covert means". Exhibited under it are pocket computers, tiny satellite communcations devices, a pen-photo camera, ampules with poison, a light torch with a built-in gun, cryptographic equipment and other spy paraphernlia confiscated from foreign agents.

One of the exhibits reveals that cosmonaut Konstantin Feoktistov, sent on a space mission in 1964, served in the army's intelligence service during the Second World War and successfully completed several missions behind the enemy lines before being wounded. He was just sixteen years old at the time.

Deputy Comments on Opening

LD1110090990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Statement by A.P. Kondaurov, deputy chief of the KGB Public Relations Center, on the opening of the KGB Museum in KGB Headquarters's Chekists Hall on 10 October; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] These documents are becoming the property of journalists and the public and are being presented to them so that they can gain a clear idea of what the State Security Committee actually is, what it is from within. Whereas previously we had to make abstract assertions and perform abstract defense, now we can show concrete results of our work, to make it clear that questions of ensuring state security are a fairly serious matter and that it has to be dealt with at a high professional level.

Kryuchkov Meets ASSOCIATED PRESS Representatives

LD1110095990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Interview with Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the State Security Committee, KGB, by unidentified ASSOCIATED PRESS representatives at the Moscow KGB headquarters on 19 September; Kryuchkov's remarks are in Russian with subsequent English translation, AP representatives remarks are in English with subsequent Russian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Kryuchkov] Our esteemed guests, I would like to ask a few questions in order to get a clearer idea of our program today. This is probably the first time that you have been in the KGB, yes?

[AP representative] Yes, yes.

[Kryuchkov] Well, I would like to express the hope that it won't be the last time. [laughter]

I have in mind the very best intentions, of course. You are our guests, and apart from that there are more of you than there are of us [word indistinct]. I think that such a great deal has been written about the KGB—and you have probably read a great deal. Even if it is only one hundredth of what has been written about the KGB, one has to assume that you know more about this organization than its chairman. But as we don't have a great deal of time, I think the most rational thing would be questions, and I will answer them—because if I were to suddenly start talking about the KGB, you would say that the chairman had started to engage in propaganda.

Nevertheless, I would like to say a few phrases, literally. First, we are glad of this meeting with representatives of a major news agency of the United States, such as ASSOCIATED PRESS. I ask you to put aside, for this hour, all your tendentious ideas qbout our organization, and to believe us, if only for this hour. Where emotion prevails over reason and there is prejudice, it is very difficult to conduct a dialogue. We feel that in the history of the Cheka, the KGB, there have been glorious traditions and pages, but there have also been tragic pages. We have resolutely discarded the negative aspects and feel that in the history of the state security bodies and in their activity, we have opened a new, clean page.

Of course, when we speak about a new clean page, then there is a kind of conditionality here, because those forms and methods which are used, say, to our U.S. partners—we still speak in this way—and their Soviet partners, these of course have their own specific features. We have thrown open the doors of the KGB, and are trying to speak as much as possible about this organization, first and foremost to the Soviet public, the Soviet people—because both of you and we are guided above all by national interests. If we had not opened up this page, no doubt our meeting would not be taking place today.

Moreover, we have drawn up a draft law on the KGB. It is included in the agenda of the Supreme Soviet session, and will be considered soon. It will be the first law in the history of the KGB that will be placed in the public domain, and that everyone—both in this country and abroad—will be able to read. There will, of course, be secret appendices, but they will derive from the spirit of the law. Perestroyka is under way in our country. It is continuing, but is proceedings with very great difficulties, and I must say in general that you should not seek opponents of this restructuring among KGB employees. We back restructuring, and it may be something new to you when I say that Cheka members were were among were among the first to say that we can't carry on living like this, and much has to be changed in our country and in our society. We saw the negative phenomena and the shortcomings in our society. We saw them more than others, because we have more information than other people.

We believe that we are making our contribution to the strengthening of confidence between peoples and states. Our contribution takes the form of the objective information that we supply to our leadership. Of course, the people who obtain this information need to engage in intelligence, and we do so. I think that the CIA also engages in this, and we understand their desire to learn as much as possible about us. Naturally, we do not assist each other. We don't tell them they can work to their hearts content in the Soviet Union. If we notice something, we take the appropriate measures.

When confidence between states and countries triumphs and rules, I think we will then have no need for intelligence services. I think that intelligence and counterintelligence services will only exist in companies. Commercial secrets are of particular interest now. Such services already exist in U.S. companies. We don't have them yet because our Soviet business world is too young and inexperienced.

We believe the United States and the Soviet Union. Let me note a few fields of such possible cooperation: the fight against terrorism; against the drugs trade; against smuggling; and against all forms of organized crime which transcend state borders. I have to say that you can also add to that the battle for human rights. You will have noticed that our attitude to the individual in the Soviet Union has changed sharply. If previously we used to subordinate everything to society and proceed on that basis, today the individual is at the focus of things.

Thank you for listening. I can now reply to questions, if you have any.

[AP representative] First of all, on behalf of the board of directors of ASSOCIATED PRESS, I would like to express gratitude for your giving us the opportunity to come here and meet you; and now my question.

This is a question on the issue of the Near East, where countries, the interests of such countries as the United States, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and the Soviet Union are clashing, and we see how in this situation the Soviet Union is giving support to the activity of the United States. Is there any kind of exchange of information taking place between the CIA and the KGB?

[Kryuchkov] Well, we know your position in this conflict, and you know our position, and perhaps for the first time in the history of our relations over the past decades we are acting jointly in many spheres. I think that you have asked a very interesting question. We are not exchanging information with the CIA on this problem, although I am certain that here it would be possible for us to report something to each other, especially as regards the security of your and our citizens. If you initiate this back in Washington or New York you know our positive attitude toward this.

I would further like to say that we hope that the whole arsenal of opportunities to resolve this problem by political means has not been exhausted, and if God helps us to resolve the problem by political means, then it should be managed without unnecessary victims. Do you mind if I sit down?

[AP representative] Please!

[Kryuchkov] Thank you. I think this will be more comfortable, or else I will be towering above you. Please. [laughter]

[AP representative] You said that maintaining national security is at the center of the KGB's attention. I would like to ask you a question. Who do regard as the Soviet Union's main enemies at the present time?

[Kryuchkov] I should tell you that we do not regard the United States as our main enemy. The United States—because you are representing this country. [as heard] There is no single country which would be designated an enemy of the Soviet Union. But we negatively appraise any hostile subversive activity against the USSR, as well as the activity of extremist elements, or any other direction that is not marked by a loyal and friendly attitude toward our country.

Somewhere around 25-28 million of our compatriots who at one time or another left the USSR live outside the borders of the USSR. Perhaps among you there are some whose native roots lie in Russia. Possibly. The majority of them are well disposed toward us, and we are well disposed toward them. But a certain proportion of them occupy positions that are not loyal, or are even hostile towards to us. naturally, we give them adequate thought.

[AP representative] Is any difference perceived between an extremist and a supporter of radical democratic reforms?

[Kryuchkov] I think that a difference, of course, definitely has to be perceived. We have forces which we call radical, but which, let us say, would have us move from one state of affairs to another overnight. That is impossible. That is the radical point of view. They advocate radical changes; we also advocate radical changes, transformations. But there are those who do not reckon with the political institutions, with the interests of society—who violate public order. This has a negative effect on the economy, on the political situation in our country. They are not fussy about their choice of form and method of struggle against those who disagree with them. I think these are extremists. Those who are today destroying monuments to Lenin, are performing outrages against sacred places marking our great victory in the Great Patriotic War—these are extremists, too. We probably all have the radical urge. We would like to achieve tangible changes as soon as possible, but I think that if we are hasty, then we will not go down in history, but rather be caught up in the mess of history.

[AP representative] In other words, if radicals carry out peaceful demonstrations, will those be considered activities against the state?

[Kryuchkov] No, as you know, they carry out a great many peaceful demonstrations. Even now, when first and foremost it is necessary to gather in the harvest, they are busy with demonstrations. I think it would be possible to postpone the demonstrations for a while.

[AP representative] Could you describe the powers and functions that the CPSU Central Committee has with regard to the KGB—and how has the situation changed in recent times?

[Kryuchkov] The situation changed radically as soon as the former Article Six of our Constitution was abolished. Previously the leadership of the Committee for State Security was implemented by the corresponding subdivision, the corresponding department in the party Central Committee, and by the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

We even have an article from 1959, in the preamble of which it is written that the leadership is implemented by the party Central Committee. Now this has ended. The leadership of the state security bodies is implemented by the president, by the Presidential Council, and specifically by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security. As a member of the government, I am also part of the Council of Ministers, of course, with all the consequences which ensue from this. And the relevant subdepartment at the USSR Ministry of Finance monitors the financial side of our activities. I'd like to say—and this is absolutely objective—that the CPSU Central Committee's supervision of the work of the state security bodies used to be very strict. I can tell you that it was stricter than the supervision being carried out now. We know that. and after this they'll put us on an even tighter rein—God forbid!

[AP representative] Mr Chairman, as far as I know, the State Security Committee performs functions which in our country are the domain of both the CIA and FBI. If I'm correct, perhaps you could explain in general terms how your resources are allocated?

[Kryuchkov] You're quite right. But you know, firstly, I'd very much like to know the official figures for the budget of the U.S. special services. You have no official figures on this. They have not been published in our country either. Our State Security Committee comprises the CIA—I am a former CIA chief, I was chief of this organization for 15 years: incidentally, it was very interesting and jolly work. Then we have counterintelligence—the FBI; we also have the National Security Agency; and some others come under us, too. You know, I am aware of why your special services are separate. There are naturally political considerations. This question is also raised in our country. I believe we should not be hasty in this. There are two reasons. First, it would immediately reduce the efficiency of the work of our organization. And second, it would immediately be more expensive for the Soviet Union. We are not a wealthy country like you. When we publish data on our budget, and we support this, I think you will have an extra opportunity to see for yourselves that in certain areas of our operational activities we succeed through quality, not quantity. Don't think I'm showing off.

[AP representative] In your earlier remarks on the Near East you said that you would welcome an initiative on an exchange of information with the CIA in the interests of the security of our states.

[Kryuchkov] Citizens...

[AP representative, interrupting] Why are you waiting for an initiative from the other side instead of making such a proposal yourselves?

[Kryuchkov] What an excellent question! Thank you. This is not my first meeting with representatives of the United States from different fields and at different levels. We have always sent signals about our readiness for contacts on various matters and problems. Our signals have been delivered to those for whom they were intended. We have received the reply that we will get to that stage, that we have to wait a bit, we mustn't rush into anything. So we aren't rushing into anything. As far as Mr. Webster is concerned, you don't have him appearing on television. He doesn't receive foreign representatives. That is prohibited in your country. Our journalists attempted to interview him, but they did not succeed. So I think that in this sphere and area of our glasnot, we have probably overtaken you.

[AP representative] Do you have any indications that Soviet citizens in Iraq at this moment are in any danger?

[Kryuchkov] Yes, the situation there is not an easy one. We have groups of specialists there, though in effect they are not working. The conditions are difficult. We are concerned about what is going to happen to them, and we consider the Iraqi authorities responsible for their lives and health.

[AP representative] Are you of the view that they are in an equal danger to that in which Western citizens find themselves.

[Kryuchkov] Everything is relative, of course. Everything is relative. Of late the situation for our specialists has deteriorated. To be more precise, the conditions in which they find themselves have got worse. We will evidently be tackling the issue of recalling them. They are at exclusively civilian installations.

[AP representative] In your introductory remarks you spoke of the law on the KGB, which is in the process of being drawn up, and said that it has classified appendices. For us, this idea is completely alien. Perhaps you could explain what you have in mind?

[Kryuchkov] For a start, this idea is not alien to you. I don't think that U.S. special services have turned everything inside out and have published everything they have. You will be better aware of the real situation. That's by way of an observation. The Supreme Soviet has adopted for consideration a draft law on the state security bodies. This was a few days ago. This draft law has already been through several hearings in the committees of the Supreme Soviet. We have taken into consideration all the remarks that were voiced, and hope that during the session we may perhaps be heard out a couple of times. That is, we shall go through two readings. I am certain that it will not be adopted at the first reading, despite the fact that it's a very good, an excellent law. When this law is adopted and published, and comes into effect, certain more detailed appendices will of course emerge to this law, but they will be appendices that stem from the spirit of the law. It is quite natural that not everything that will be proposed will be made public. That is what I wanted to say, and I repeat it. But the main thing is something else—and it is very important—that the appropriate committees of the Supreme Soviet will know all this. Incidentally, I've heard that in congress you have an intelligence subcommittee. We borrowed that, put the proposal to the Supreme soviet, and, in our committee for defence and state security, we've also set up a subcommittee for state security.

[AP representative] We've heard that the central government is being diminished and that there will be more power in the hands of the republics. How will this affect the KGB?

[Kryuchkov] You're right. Our union government will be sharing its powers with the union republics. I think that if someone in our country objects to that, there is just one reasons: They haven't yet realized the delightfulness of such a situation: Now they will not be responsible for everything in our Union. And we in the Committee for State Security will also split up functions beteen the union and the republican committees. One thing will be done by the union committee, another will be done by the republican, and something else we will do jointly. We think that this will be reflected in the union treaty that is being prepared. Your U.S. practice helps us here, but not a great deal. U.S. society and the U.S. state have, throughout their history, passed through many pages. There were probably instances in which the states commanded the capital, and then a different time, when the capital fully commanded the states. But now we have somehow divided things up, and everything here is normal. Admittedly, from U.S. practice some combination of executive, court, and legislative powers in the United States of America gives rise to a question in our country, and we are carefully studying it. This exists in your country.

I want to explain this. The minister of justice—is that executive power? He is performing certain procuratorial functions. We're following Montesquieu. We strictly divide the legislative, executive, and court powers. Maybe, in 100 years' time, we'll get to your practice. We'll see.

[AP representative] In the countries of Eastern Europe that have gained their freedom, there is an insistent demand that the secret archives of the special services should be open to public scrutiny. Could you say whether there is a possibility that a legislative act will be passed in the Soviet Union which will allow Soviet citizens to see secret KGB archives?

[Kryuchkov] As far as the Eastern European countries are concerned, a change of regimes has taken place or is taking place. employees of the bodies of state security worked honestly for the regimes that existed there before. I cannot but express my regret at the situation in which they find themselves. I'm telling you honestly. The new authorities will be tackling the question of archives. That is up to them. As far as the archives of the State Security Committee are concerned, we have opened up a large number, we are opening up a large number more, and we hope that in our forthcoming legislation on this issue we will attempt to determine precisely what will be opened up to the public and place in the public domain, and when. We know about world experience. It is varied. I also think that we will have various time limits, but I am certain that these time limits will not run to centuries. I am talking of decades.

[AP representative] Does the new law provide for the opening up of secret archives, particularly with regard to personnel?

[Kryuchkov] We shall see [passage indistinct] An appendix to the law will have something to say about personnel. There will also be a fixed time limit. We are impatiently awaiting 1997 or 1998, I think it is, when the British are going to open up their archives. They have already announced they will do so. If they do not put the date back, we shall be able to see then.

[AP representative] [Passage indistinct] Can you foresee in the realistic future a day when the press will become quite independent of the government, and can such a situation harm state security?

[Kryuchkov] I see. First, I'd like to wish you further success in developing the independence of your own press. Second, as far as our press is concerned, I don't know if there is any press in the world that is as independent as a considerable section of our press. It even writes disrespectfully of the president, and of the government and individual institutions. Moreover, we have got to the point where even the KGB is criticised. I can tell you that three years ago this could only be the stuff that nightmares are made of! [laughter]

At one time, you know, I worked as a diplomat, and had nothing to do with intelligence work and state security bodies. I had occasion to be press attache at our embassy in Hungary. That is very interesting work, and since then I have in a sense been closely acquainted with journalists. I think that for any press, for the press of any country, the characteristic features first and foremost must be objectivity and a high level of civic spirit—everything else will follow in its place.

[AP representative] Mr. Chairman, are the people who live in your country convinced that the dark days about which you have spoken really have disappeared into the past, and that no changes in your country will bring back the practice of human rights violations?

[Kryuchkov] I don't think everyone is convinced. I think there are people who fear that something black might once again return to us from the past. We intend to convince our Soviet people that this is not so. These feelings and fears that people have are being aroused from various sides. I think that those who hold certain extreme positions will rouse these fears whether they want to or not.

[AP representative] Mr. Chairman, have any discussions taken place following the discovery of secret eavesdropping devices in the still unoccupied premises of the U.S. Embassy, and has the question of any material restitution for the damage been considered by your government?

[Kryuchkov] An excellent question. Here is a question for you: Have you discovered any of them there? [laughter] We have found some in our embassy building in Washington, but you haven't found anything. When you find something we'll discuss it.

[AP representative] Do you mean to say there aren't any here?

[Kryuchkov] Yes.

[AP representative] Do you mean that the building is being demolished for no reason?

[Kryuchkov] Of course. But you are a wealthy country and you have a great deal of money. [laughter]

[AP representative] I have a quick question continuing the Iraq topic. Over the past week, have you had any indications about your citizens being subjected to persecution and danger from the army?

[Kryuchkov] Yes, we had something like that, there have been elements of that. Incidentally, I have been chairman of the Committee for State Security since September 1988, that is to say for two years, and the information I give about the U.S. Embassy building is absolutely objective. But I am not so naive as to think I can convince you of something with words. So I speak, and you must draw your conclusions.

[AP representative] Has the change in the oversight of the KGB from the Central Committee to the Supreme Soviet changed its priorities, the main tasks in your work?

[Kryuchkov] In principle our main tasks have been retained, to a considerable extent. New tasks have made their appearance which are linked to the changes that are taking place in our country and in international life. New addressees have made their appearance, new consumers for our information. We just don't know what we will do when dozens and dozens of parties come into being in our country—they, too, might show an interest in our information. But we have no intention of avoiding contacts with any new parties, though perhaps it would be cheaper not to have contacts with any of them. We haven't yet decided this for ourselves.

[AP representative] I want to thank you on behalf of the board of directors of the Associated Press for taking your time to be with us and to respond to questions.

[Kryuchkov] Thank you.

[AP representative] I have a book written by Ray Cline on the Central Intelligence Agency, and it's written in Russian.

[Kryuchkov] Thank you.

[AP representative] I assure you that there are no bugs inside.

[Kryuchkov] [chuckles] And we would like to give you this book of ours: It is called The Red Book of the VeCheKa [all-Russian Special Commission for Combatting Counterrevolution and Sabotage], and is in two volumes. It is about the history of the VeCheKa and the KGB. It's in russian, and we wanted to give it to everyone taking part—if, of course, they won't take it off you when you're in America. [laughter]

[AP representative] I don't think that they will. Thank you.

[Kryuchkov] Thank you for your attention.

Kalugin Lawyer Protests Ryzhkov Action

PM1110135890 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p 2

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Moscow Diary"]

[Text] Boris Kuznetsov, lawyer for the current people's deputy of the USSR and former KGB Major General Oleg Kalugin, said in an interview with the Interfax news agency that he has irrefutable proof that the decision to strip Kalugin of his military rank—allegedly taken away by the USSR Council of Ministers—was in fact not authorized by this joint body.

"That decision was made by Nikolay Ryzhkov himself," said Boris Kuznetsov. "The document about degrading Oleg Kalugin carries only Ryzhkov's signature certified by the Business Manager of the USSR Council of Ministers."

The lawyer also said that he has letters of some USSR Ministers stating taht there was no meeting of the Council of Ministers on June 29, though the decision about degrading Kalugin bore this date.

As we know, the Moscow City Court has turned down Oleg Kalugin's complaint about Nikolay Ryzhkov's illegal action, on the account that the decision was made during a meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers, a joint body. Boris Kuznetsov told Interfax that he has appealed to the Russian Federation's Supreme Court protesting this action by the head of the Council of Ministers. The appeal is to be examined October 12.

Court To Consider Appeal

LD1210072190 Moscow TASS in English 0702 GMT 12 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—The Russian Supreme Court will today cnsider an appeal by former KGB Major-General Oleg Kalugin against a Moscow City Court decision to reject his complaint against Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Kalugin had lodged the complaint with the City Court, saying that the June 29 decision by the Soviet Government to strip him of his rank was "invalid".

Kalugin and his lawyer submitted replies from several ministers, who wrote that "according to their information, the government's June 29 meeting either did not take place, or they did not know about it".

The City Court rejected the complaint on the grounds that the decision to strip Kalugin of his rank had been taken by the Council of Ministers, which is a collective body, and hence any complaints against only one official were "illegitimate".

Simultaneously, the court sent a question to the Council of Ministers, requesting explanations.

In early August, the former general filed two more complaints to the City Court, one against President Mikhail Gorbachev, who stripped him of his awards, and the other against KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, who denied him his general's pension.

Earlier this month, Moscow City court began hearings on Kalugin's complaint against Kryuchkov. The hearings will be continued on October 23 after the court receives additional information, including a reply from the government to the court's question.

The court is yet to take a decision on Kalugin's complaint against Gorbachev.

Frolov Denies Staff's 'No-Confidence' Report

LD1110042690 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 10 TASS—Ivan Frolov, editor-in-chief of PRAVDA, an organ of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, refuted a report in the Soviet press that the editorial staff passed a no-confidence vote on him at a party meeting held early in October.

He made this refutation at a news conference here today.

Frolov said that, despite the fact that the newspaper has many able journalists, many staff members "use old methods and old yardsticks". It followed from his words that this factor was at the basis of the conflict.

PRAVDA special correspondent Vladislav Yegorov, deputy secretary of the PRAVDA Party Committee, lashed out at Frolov after the news conference.

"I cannot speak on behalf of all staff members but, judging by sentiments of many, it is impossible to work with the present editor-in-chief," he stressed.

PRAVDA runs a story in its issue of October 11, explaining the essence of the conflict.

It says, among other things, as follows. "The party meeting of the newspaper's staff has not adopted any resolution of no-confidence in the editor-in-chief.

"The communists of the editorial office requested the plenary meeting of the central committee to accelerate the solution of several issues concerning the newspaper, including those which had been put before party bodies by the PRAVDA leadership previously.

"They requested the establishment of the PRAVDA amalgamation. As it was reported at the plenary meeting, these issues will be examined by the CPSU Central Committee."

Energy Ministry To Export Uranium for Currency

LD1110062390 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0152 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, October 11 (TANJUG)—The Soviet government has approved to its Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry to yearly export 5,000 tonnes of natural uranium in the 1990-95 period and collect convertible currencies for it, [word indistinct], a news agency here claims referring to "competent sources." Also to be contracted for such deals is that raw materials processed, i.e. nuclear waste products, are to be sent back to the exporting country to be stored there, the agency reports.

The said matter having not yet been discussed in Soviet parliament, surely to be asked is the question of where radioactive waste products are to be kept, i.e. whether local bodies concerned have consented to have them kept in their territory. This question is seen as possible to cause tension in relations with the authorities and local population in the areas in which such refuse should be buried.

Moscow Students To Operate Radio Station

PM1110140090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p 2

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Moscow Diary"]

[Text] Students from Moscow University's Department of Journalism will now have their own radio station. It will operate on the 250-metre band from 7 to 9 p.m. This was made possible with the help of department administrators, the editors of OGONEK Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee.

MOSCOW NEWS on Paper's 60th Anniversary

PM1110140290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p 3

[MOSCOW NEWS editors article: "Before and After 60—Collective Thoughts on the Jubilee"]

[Text] We must be careful not to put on airs on the occasion of the jubilee. However, some think the sin of pride is not so very bad, and the temptation to fall for it not that perilous. The fact that our newspaper has managed to survive for 60 years—from Stalin's collectivization right up to Gorbachev's perestroyka—can be seen as its own reward.

A newspaper lives as long as it is interesting to read. It can be independent from anyone but the reader. MOSCOW NEWS managed to pull through in the last few years only because once a week people queued up outside the newspaper kiosks from as early as six in the morning in the hope of getting their copy. We couldn't let their interest in the democratic processes reported by MOSCOW NEWS die. For the last few years we have been fighting for our recently gained status of "people's newspaper" in every weekly issue.

Our colleagues at other periodicals increasingly call MOSCOW NEWS a "well-to-do" newspaper. Frankly, we are offended. The description doesn't fit. But let's not dwell on our current headaches. We had enough of them before the jubilee. But we must say a few words about how we earned this alleged status of "well-to- do", which seems to provoke envy in others.

It was not so very long ago that Moscow was rife with a disquieting rumour about the impending closure of MOSCOW NEWS. Or when the Party's "second in command" publicly slated MOSCOW NEWS from his post as a high-ranking official. Have all of you forgotten how MOSCOW NEWS was vilely slandered, how there were threats to reduce circulation if the paper refused to cooperate. That was all quite recently, a couple years ago. In keeping with the logic of the apparat we would inevitably be closed down. The fact that the newspaper continued was unquestionably due to the advent of democracy and the new politics.

Only those who are ill-prepared can be surprised by an emergency. But we were prepared for it by Khrushchev's "thaw", which begot the hope for democracy, and by Brezhnev's "stagnation", under pressure of which the potential for democratic thought accrued. Fortunately MOSCOW NEWS was initially oriented towards the reading audience abroad. Since 1985 precisely this has made it easier for MOSCOW NEWS "new think" to attract the Soviet reader. The building of bridges between East and West (the need for this having been acknowledged—grudgingly—even by conservatives) was one of the principles of the renovation of MOSCOW NEWS. We were indeed lucky.

But it would be naive to believe that we foresaw everything: the emergence of a multitude of political parties, sovereignty of the Union Repubics, privatization of state property. Of course we did our best to stay at the vanguard of social thinking, but often—like the rest of society—we were unaware of what lay round the corner. In this sense, we indeed became the newspaper of perestroyka, with all of its merits and faults. A society in the process of cardinal change can only be envied.

Our 60 years in print mean that no matter what happens tomorrow, MOSCOW NEWS has had a long life and an important mission. But the pre-perestroyka potential seems to have been used up. The newly gained freedom confronts us with dangerous temptation—we have no experience of such freedom. We began our career in a society of coercion and witnessed emanicipation from coercion. But can we say for sure that we are living among really emancipated people? Democracy and personal emancipation are not at all the same thing. The history of democracy provides a wealth of examples of this, from the execution of Socrates at the demand of the democratic majority in Athens to the baiting of Andrey Sakharov by the majority of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. This means that despite our apparent "well-to-do" status we have only just set out on a long road. No matter what we hear during this jubilee, the ultimate conclusion will be made by the readers' referendum—the subscription campaign now under way.

ZHURNALIST Adopts New Motto

LD1110164490 Moscow TASS in English 1636 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—A new motto—the press and other media are free—has replaced the notorious "Workers of the World, Unite" on the front cover of the Soviet magazine "Zhurnalist".

The magazine editors believe that as the multi-party press is taking shape in the Soviet Union, the professional publication has no right to affiliate itself to any one party. It intends to maintain an impartial and independent outlook.

The magazines's chief task is to help readers find their own way in the overwhelming stream of contradictory information.

Suspected Priest Murderer Released

PM1110135690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p 2

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Moscow Diary"]

[Text] One of the suspects in the murder of priest Aleksandr Men has been apprehended and set free. Colonel Stepan Astashkin, chief of the homicide department of the Moscow Regional Soviet Executive Committee, refused to give any comments on this case referring to the secret of the investigation. However MOSCOW NEWS learned anyways that the militia is now actively working on a version according to which priest Aleksandr Men became a victim of intercommunal religious strife. An official, who asked not to mention his name, because of the investigation, informed MOSCOW NEWS that a man was apprehended suspected of murdering the priest. The suspect was released because there are no direct evidence of his guilt. The murder weapon has still not been found and the investigation is continuing.

Intolerance of Media Criticism Deplored

PM1010125790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Articel by Pavel Gutiontov: "Political Diary": "Journalist Behind Bars of Pluralism"]

[Text] No journalist, upon entering his—to be haughty about it—professional field, provides a written guarantee that everything he ever writes will necessarily please his readers. There is no point in even trying—it just will not work. As is well known, there are as many opinions as there are people, and tastes differ—which is exactly why people argue about tastes, and so desperately....

Thus, in the latest mail I received a letter from an unhappy reader. In early August I published a remark that the KGB chairman had disclosed in a television interview the existence, known to him, of some kind of progressive wing of the "Pamyat" society whose activity he fully supported. Well, I asked for clarification as to who these wonderful people are, for, to my shame, I knew nothing of them. The KGB is still silent on the matter (perhaps it is seeking the progressive wing?), but reader Ye. from the settlement of Pervomayskiy outside Moscow comments: "The Arabs sentenced the slandering yid Rushdie to death. Likewise I promise to cut your throat, you Asiatic yid nonentity." He even signed properly with his full name, he even gave his return address, as is the custom among decent people... Incidentally, I intend to pass this letter on to the prosecutor's office so criminal proceedings can be taken against the author, for I do not want anyone to think they are living in a country where, even without being an ayatollah, you can sentence to death compatriots who have displeased you. If there is pluralism, let there be pluralism.

It is another matter that cunning people have emerged who try to use this term to establish their right to write with total disregard for the facts, but facts are stubborn things—they are susceptible of various assessments, of course, but unfortunately they themselves do not change according to the assessment. So when liars are caught there is no reason to feign total surprise and say: Is it good to gag dissenters, dear colleagues?

Nevertheless. The morals that my reader Ye. is trying to cultivate in our tattered society are unacceptable no matter what fine feelings you use as a guideline. For instance, I actively dislike what PRAVDA own correspondent V. Drozd writes about the processes taking place in the West Ukraine. I see him as tendentious and, once again, as making free with the facts. This angers me, if you like. But I am certainly not prepared to support the campaign mounted in Lvov against the disliked journalist: Now even the oblast soviet is discussing whether the PRAVDA bureau should be completely eliminated and the correspondent thrown out of the oblast. That would be going too far, dear readers. If you disagree, if you feel aggrieved or insulted, then go to court, which is the only body that can punish and pardon according to the Law on the Press. Any other path will inevitably lead to the forcible suppression of people who disagree with the dominant view and therefore to arbitrariness, whose meaning does not change whether it is "democratic" in complexion or the work of the party apparatus. Does Vyacheslav Chornovil, chairman of the Lvov Oblast Soviet and a man who I think quite recently experienced for himself the charms of ideological diktat, not realize this?

It has to be said that today there are all too many people who want to read in the newspapers only things that are to their liking. Now President I. Karimov of Uzbekistan is publicly expressing doubts as to whether those central publications which, the president believes, do not properly reflect the situation in the republic should be printed and distributed in the republic. That kind of assessment fits virtually any criticism in the press...

And a rally in the center of Alma-Ata demands the recall of IZVESTIYA own correspondent Vladimir Ardayev. What has happened? The journalist filed and the newspaper published a 34-line piece entitled "Explosion at School." A homemade device exploded, almost destroying the... grille installed between the Kazakh and Russian classrooms...

Maybe Ardayev was simply lying? No, unfortunately both the explosion and—most importantly—the grille were true. Who should be the target for aggrieved feelings? And who in this case is provoking interethnic tension—the journalist or his angry opponents? And to what end?

I will cite an extract from Vladimir Ardayev's official memorandum. It indicates who precisely is not suited by truthful information filed "to the center."

"...The obkom [party oblast committee] secretary invited me into a room where representatives of the demonstrators were already gathered. V. Anufriyev, second secretary of the Central Committee, and his entourage came in later. He either did not notice me, or did not recognize me. When he was asked about the report (more or less in the following form: 'Why is the Central Committee not taking measures against correspondents who are tendentious and chauvinist in their coverage of events in the republic?'), Anufriyev replied in the following terms:

" 'You think I've never called them (meaning IZVESTIYA—author's note)? That paper is in opposition to the party, they take no notice of us. So you include in your demands the recall of Ardayev from the republic, and I will make a point of conveying them to the president. And if the president does not act, I will make a speech at the session after the adoption of sovereignty and demand that Ardayev be declared persona non grata, as in any civilized country...'

"Today," Ardayev writes, "the Central Committee secretary is categorically denying that he gave any such advice and promise to the informals. A familiar approach! But this time this was all said publicly, in the presence of two or three dozen witnesses..."

That was not the end of the matter. In full accordance with the secretary's recommendations, another rally was held the next day in Alma-Ata. Then television showed a press conference held by K. Sultanov, chief of the republic Communist Party Central Committee Ideological Department, who confirmed: "The public demanded that Ardayev be expelled from Kazakhstan, and Comrade Anufriyev supported this demand. What of it, everything is correct..."

Lovely. I am especially touched by the astonishing notions about the customs reigning, so party officials believe, in "civilized countries" (V. Anufriyev, who took part in the press conference, again cited their experience). And the question of whose bright idea it was to partition schools with grilles somehow receded far into the background...

A year ago I met with Nursultan Nazarbayev, the current president of Kazakhstan, who had then only just become head of the republic's party organization. To be blunt, he had received a difficult legacy, and he spoke about it with the maximum frankness. In passing, Nazarbayev resolutely supported the position of IZVESTIYA and its correspondent Ardayev, who were accused of "pandering to the nationalists"—at that time attempts were being made to expel the correspondent from the republic on that pretext. And now the selfsame people are declaring him to be a "chauvinist"—for the selfsame purpose.

I freely admit that Ardayev's work, the professional work of a journalist who tells his newspaper's readers what is happening in real life, which is by no means perfect, may not please some people.

But if so, his opponents have a wonderful opportunity to respond "in the same place"—on the newspaper page—and to offer their own interpretation of events. And again, there are also the courts, which must clearly distinguish between pluralism of opinions and "pluralism of facts." Precisely that is civilized practice, and so there is no reason to excite public feeling by absolutely unparliamentary methods.

Civilized practice, I agree, is much harder. You have to uphold your viewpoint via arguments and facts, rather than "cut throats," as (one way or another) many people have been accustomed to doing.... Onerous though it may be, they will have to learn to change their ways.

Arbatov Discusses Soviet Foreign Policy

AU1010135390 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 6 Oct 90 p 6

[Interview with Georgiy Arbatov, chairman of the International Policy Commission of the Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Moscow Institute of American Studies, by Peter Dunai; place and date not given: "Only a New Political Order Can Protect Us From the Mistakes of the Past"—first paragraph is NEPSZABADSAG introduction]

[Excerpts] Georgiy Arbatov granted our Moscow correspondent an interview on his coming book on the reevaluation of the last few decades of Soviet foreign policy and on the danger of remaining Stalinist elements.

[Dunai] In the last few years, with your assessment of the Soviet military industrial complex, and with your reevaluation of foreign policy decisions, you have joined, to use an American expression, the "doves" among the forces that influence Soviet international policy. In the book that you are writing, you even mention the danger of a coup in relation to Khrushchev's dismissal in 1964; this reference is probably not unfounded. Nowadays, do the "hawks" have the strength to alter the situation, and to transform the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union?

[Arbatov] I do not think that they have such strength. Let us not forget that many officers, and even many generals, do not behave like the "hawks" that you mentioned. There are also intelligent people in the military industry complex. However, I am afraid that perestroyka's difficulties are increasing. The situation is bad, and if there is any further deterioration, we may have to say goodbye to the things that we have already acquired.... Time is running out. We cannot make any more serious mistakes. If we achieved improved results in the economy, then that would lend credibility to the leadership, and the stabilization process could begin. [passage omitted]

[Dunai] How do you assess the 1956 intervention in Hungary?

[Arbatov] I know that this subject is particularly delicate for you. I would not even enter into any great detail on this issue. Personally, I know little about the situation at the time, I was still young in 1956. What I do remember from the atmosphere at the time is that the leadership was afraid that everything would crumble. Let us not forget that we were right in the middle of the cold war. If a superpower is afraid, then that has very serious consequences for its (small) neighbors.... Nevertheless, in the end, 1956 backfired on the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

[Dunai] In your book, you write that in 1980, Afghanistan "saved" Poland from Soviet tanks.

[Arbatov] That is only my theory. I think that our "success" in Angola went to our head. Then, one intervention led to another.... There was no stopping us, the temptation to use force was too great. Afterwards, the West almost expected us to intervene in Poland.... When the Poles introduced their state of emergency, the West imposed disproportionately strict sanctions against Poland. It was as if the sanctions would punish the supposed Soviet intervention.

[Dunai] Let us return to Afghanistan. Who made the decisions?

[Arbatov] The decisions were made by Brezhnev, Ustinov, Gromyko, and Andropov. I was not surprised by the decisions taken by Brezhnev, who was already seriously ill, and Ustinov, who had the reputation of a politically limited man. But how could Gromyko and Andropov make such a mistake? I still cannot understand it today. [passage omitted]

[Dunai] 1985 was the year of perestroyka.

[Arbatov] Yes, 1985 was the beginning of a fundamental change. We won serious political battles, and we also made some mistakes, of course. We succeeded in toning down the concept of enemy images, and we dissolved the cold war structures that had been built up after World War II. With this, we rectified two previous mistakes. We abandoned the idea of exporting the revolution, and we stopped acting as messiahs. Indeed, while we had advocated peaceful coexistence, our partners had felt uneasy because we did not stop the ideological battle, and we did not stop supporting liberation movements. Furthermore, we gave up on our imperial aspirations, which had grown, especially after World War II. The internationalist assistance that we advocated often served as a cover for imperial ambitions.

[Dunai] Do you think that the changes initiated in 1985 went far enough? Is there a danger of Gorbachev becoming the hostage of conservative forces?

[Arbatov] Look, I know the Central Committee of the CPSU very well. My opinion is that Gorbachev was more of a hostage in the past than he is today. The old Central Committee (the one that existed until the 28th CPSU Congress in 1990) was conservative. They only supported our general secretary during the first phase of perestroyka.

[Dunai] How dangerous is the crumbling economy?

[Arbatov] It is "only" dangerous in that everything depends on the economy. Nobody would want to leave a flourishing federation. But what is happening now? The republics are withdrawing behind their fortifications, they are issuing their own money, and everybody is running around, trying to save whatever they can. If we overcome this stage and consolidate, then even the conservatives within the military industry complex will lose their chances. I am confident, that we will survive....

[Dunai] Will you survive independently, or with Western assistance?

[Arbatov] Western support is very important. Look at Japan, South Korea, and the FRG: They would hardly have recovered without foreign assistance. Nevertheless, the basis on which we have to build is a successful domestic reform program, the elimination of the black market, and the development of an adequate infrastructure, so that foreign investors are attracted by our possibilities.... There is also something else: We must not break off our economic relations with our neighbors in Eastern Europe.

[Dunai] Western capital is cautious, it is waiting.

[Arbatov] To be perfectly honest, we made a big mistake in not paying our debt interests and our bills on time. We should have restricted our imports, stimulated our exports, and we should have asked for further credits. We should have protected our reputation as honest debtors like a maiden protects her honor....

[Dunai] Is it possible that the solidarity that has developed between the Soviet Union and the West, in relation to the Iraqi aggression, will help Moscow recover its "honor?"

[Arbatov] Iraq is the fruit of previous U.S.-Soviet rivalry; it is a result of the notion that "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." Today, it is the duty of every civilized state to show solidarity. All the more so, because the West is also responsible for Iraq's militarization (through arms deliveries). Two conclusions are evident in this case: Arms deals have to be placed under strict international surveillance, and the United Nations have to be granted even more power.

[Dunai] Do you see any serious contradiction—perhaps a future source of conflict—between, on the one hand, the continuing superpower status of the Soviet Union, and its position based on military strength, and, on the other hand, the pressing economic problems of the country, and the Soviet Union's position as a medium-sized economic power?

[Arbatov] Only the conservatives want to maintain our superpower status (incidentally, we never called ourselves a superpower). We will continue to reduce our arsenal in accordance with the military principle of reasonable sufficiency. However, this process is not simple, and that is not only because of the opposition expressed by the military industrial complex. Just imagine that 180,000 officers (with families) have no accommodation. To that, we can add another 100,000 officers returning from Eastern Europe, who also have families, but no accommodation. In the Soviet Union, we will have to secure an apartment for them, as well as a subsistence minimum, and a civil career. These people cannot be blamed for anything, and it is the duty of the state to help them. We have to draw our conclusions—including economic conclusions—from past mistakes, and we need consolidation. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union will remain a very big country with a significant military force (albeit not an exaggeratedly great one).

Future of Radio, Television Discussed

LD1010202390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 9 Oct 90

[Interview with Y.A. Bespyatov, member of the board of the Association of Radio and Television, by correspondent Andrey Babayev, place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The history of our time will go down as a period when all kinds of unions and associations were set up. It is unavoidable that in a couple of years' time many of these will, as is usual, fall apart or become too formalistic. With all my heart, I do not wish this to happen to my colleagues, television and radio employees, who recently decided that they, too, need their own association. ART—its creators are confident of good prospects. ART—hundreds of enthusiasts to solve dozens of problems. ART—The Association of Radio and Television. Correspondent Andrey Babayev recently met with Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Bespyatov, a member of the associations' board.

[Bespyatov] Two months ago, the television and radio enterprises of oblasts, krays, and autonomous entities—chiefly those of Russia—gathered in Moscow for a constituent assembly, and they set up the Association of Radio and Television, ART. The aims of this association are to defend radio and television enterprises from those unpleasant aspects, those dangers that arise from the transition to market relations. These difficulties are further heightened by the fact that a division of television and radio is going on between the Union government and the government of Russia.

[Babayev] How does your association view this division, the creation of a Russian television and radio company?

[Bespyatov] We are watching this process of division very attentively. Why? Because the oblast and kray television and radio broadcasting enterprises themselves are affected by this process. They are moving from subordination to the Union government to subordination to the republican government. In the summer of 1990, the Union government adopted a resolution on transferring the financing of all local television and radio enterprises from the Union budget to the budget of the republican government. We would like to establish partner-like relations with the television and radio company that will form the Central Russian Program [Tsentralnaya Rossiyskaya Programma]. In our view, it would be very dangerous to overburden the all-Russian television and Radio Company with the functions of directing almost a hundred Russian oblast and kray television and radio enterprises of the same sort, only smaller. In such a case we could end up with something like Gosteleradio [State Television and Radio], but an RSFSR Gosteleradio.

[Babayev] And how many members do you have at present?

[Bespyatov] At present we have about 70 members, and oblast and kray television and radio enterprises from other republics are joining from the Ukraine and Belorussia, and the Baltic republics are showing interest in the creation of this association.

[Babayev] So I can say that the members can be not only from state television enterprises. There are also many independent radio stations and television studios.

[Bespyatov] You know, not only state, oblast, and kray television and radio companies are able to enter our association's structure, but also the television companies being set up now by major enterprises or associations of enterprises. There are already examples of this. Take the television company that exists in Petropavlosk-Kamchatskiy, provisionally called NLO [expansion unknown]. And a similar young and energetic television company such as the Leningrad Russkoye Video. They are members of our association.

Besides this, enterprises from branches of related industries which are interested in the development of television also belong to our association. These are communications enterprises, industrial enterprises, manufacturers of television and video equipment, and tapes and so on. That is to say, we are aiming in the long term to gather together those industries and subindustries, administered by different authorities, which work on the single process. It is essential, with the transfer to Russian administration, to preserve the size of budget financing without any losses, and not only preserve but also guarantee the possibility of no reduction in broadcasting.

In connection with the increase in the prices of equipment and material, we have set ourselves the task in the future of commercializing our work and of receiving funds over and above those in the budget on a commercial basis, and the task of presenting local customs and culture. This makes it even more important that the direction of local television and radio broadcasting on no account be organized as in the past from the center, with the help of administrative bodies, but organized rather on the basis of self-government, the formula for which our Association of Radio and Television is to implement.

[Babayev] There must be some sort of coordination of the activities of both Gosteleradio and the local studios.

[Bespyatov] I agree that coordination between central television—for example we are creating an all-Russian televiion company—and coordination of the activities of local broadcasting must exist. Local broadcasting has for many years been trying to find a completely new form of partnership relations. I must say that all our members welcome the creation of other new associations, for example the cable television association. There are Siberian and Far Eastern associations of on-air broadcasting, and our members are at one and the same time also members of these associations. In short, we make no claims to a monopoly, to some sort of diktat of compulsion. Entry into our association is completely voluntary, as is leaving it, and this very thing is a guarantee of the normal economic foundation for the administration of the industry.

Economic

Dollar Worth 1.8 Rubles at New Exchange Rate

LD1110174690 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—The Soviet president's economic programme envisages cutting by three times the rouble exchange rate vis-a-vis the U.S. dollar, making each dollar worth 1.8 roubles, Deputy Chairman of the USSR State Foreign Economic Commission Ivan Ivanov told the parliamentary committee for social and economic development of Union and autonomous republics today.

The committee considered the government bill on currency regulation which will soon be submitted to parliament for consideration.

According to Ivanov, the new exchange rate will be introduced by presidential decree. Earlier this week, Chairman of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] Board Viktor Gerashchenko announced that "the new rouble's exchange rate for foreign trade operations would amount to about two roubles a dollar, starting this year".

The new exchange rate is expected to make efforts more profitable for Soviet producers and facilitate the streamlining and restriction of imports, which have been growing rapidly since Soviet enterprises were granted the right of free access to the foreign market.

Asked how the new exchange rate was arrived at, Ivanov said the rouble's purchase capacity was assessed taking into account the entire range of Soviet export commodities. The calculations were made on the basis of new wholesale prices, which the Soviet Government worked out in the spring and asked parliament to make effective from January 1, 1991.

In May, the parliament rejected the government plan for the transition to a market, saying the plan was centered around higher prices and envisaged no comprehensive market mechanism.

Ivanov noted that the rouble's exchange rate for Soviet and foreign citizens will remain at the present level of six roubles per one U.S. dollar.

Ryzhkov Addresses Agro-Industrial Workers Congress

PM1110193390 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Special correspondent A. Chupakhin report: "On the Old Foundation: Notes from the Second Congress of the Agro-Industrial Complex Workers' Union"]

[Text] From time to time people rebuild their houses. Most often these are the ones that were poorly built in the first place. Figuratively speaking, the rural trade union house was not particularly well-built. That is why it was changed a number of times in its comparatively short existence. In the opinion of a number of delegates, particularly V. Vavilin, chairman of the Murmansk oblast trade union committee, who addressed the congress, the only constant factors were the forms and methods of work that ultimately brought the union to effective disintegration—today entire organizations are leaving it.

We have already become accustomed to hearing keen criticism from platforms at various levels. There was plenty at the congress, too. There was even too much. However, the thrust of the criticism was clear: It was aimed against the timid, "drive-belt" policy of the old times. The central leadership received most criticism. Delegates accused it of being passive and inconsistent in the period of the creation and adoption by the Supreme Soviet of the laws on ownership, the enterprise, and social organizations. In the delegates' opinion, this had the result of effectively eliminating trade unions from influencing the formation of social structures and deprived them of the opportunity to effectively protect working people in the future market.

Incidentally, a rejection of the market economy clearly showed through in the majority of speeches.

"They tell us that under the market economy, things will be better. For whom?" V. Felimonov, chairman of the Voronezh Oblast committee, asked from the platform.

The opinion formed among delegates, particularly trade union leaders of different ranks, was that during the transition to the market kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms] will undoubtedly be eliminated. Then the "collapse" of agricultural production will be "inevitable."

"The program for the transition to the market economy in the agrarian sector," I. Kukhar, chairman of the Union Council of Kolkhozes, stated, "is unacceptable to rural workers. Because it talks about destroying what has been achieved and eliminating the kolkhozes...."

The speech of D. Bostan, chairman of the Moldova [Moldavia] Soviet Socialist Republic Novoanenskiy Rayon Trade Union Committee, was in virtually the same key but even more emotional. The intention of returning the land to the peasants, in her opinion, is simply irresponsible because no one has asked the peasants: "Do they want it back?"

A note of general doubt about the advisability of the rapid transition to the market economy, wittingly or not, was sounded in the report by M. Ryzhkov, former chairman of the Central Committee and now chairman of the Federation of the USSR Agro-Industrial Complex Workers' Unions. Even though he did not say "no" to the market even once, he named so many obstacles on the list of necessary conditions for the transition to the market that it would take years to remedy them.

Whether the keynote speaker meant to or not, he set the tone. The congress delegates—who frankly admitted from the rostrum and in private conversations that they were virtually unfamiliar with the market transition programs but do have a fairly general idea about the market economy itself—were naturally "afraid."

Here is an interesting point: The ones registering their fears for peasants were the trade union functionaries. The field and livestock workers themselves, who formed an "overwhelming minority" among delegates, said nothing. When I asked Gennadiy Biryukov, a young team leader from a livestock lease collective in the Mari ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], whether he would prefer his own farm to be run on a lease, he replied: "They will not let us...."

A congress of the crop farmers and processing industry workers union is no run of the mill event. The questions discussed by its delegates have a direct bearing on every citizen in the country. After all, it is our daily bread at issue. One of the speakers rightly noted: "If things are bad for the peasant, life will be impossible for the city dweller." The crop farmer's interests are defended first and foremost by his trade union. The full-time leaders working on social principles are well aware of that. Delegates' speeches contained many constructive proposals and firm demands to the USSR Government and republic organs of power.

The national government's profound understanding of these problems and of the importance of developing the sector and improving its workers' working and living conditions was expressed by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in his speech to delegates. He stressed that the crucial problems of food supply on which the government is working cannot be successfully resolved in present conditions without close cooperation with rural trade unions, the USSR Peasants' Union, the Association of Peasant Farms and Cooperatives of Russia, and the All-Union Council of Kolkhozes.

Characterizing the present situation in the economy, the speaker drew attention to the fact that the intensifying centrifugal processes, interethnic conflicts and strikes, arbitrary stoppages of enterprises and production units, and the general decline in the standard of management and discipline are having a serious destabilizing effect on it. Around 1,700 enterprises and production units were hit by strikes in the first eight months of this year alone. Worktime losses have passed 10 million man-days. The volume of output lost because enterprises were on strike is estimated at almost 1 billion rubles [R]. But subcontractors' losses due to disruptions in the supply of raw materials and components are even more significant. Quite a few of those subcontractors are producers of consumer goods. Absenteeism and stoppages in industry and construction alone meant that 200,000 people a day did no work. The overall loss is R3 billion.

As a result of all these negative phenomena the industrial production volume fell 0.9 percent in the first nine months of this year.

The fall in production was largely due to the disruption of the economic management system and the destruction of the entire vertical coordination of executive organs of management. The hasty adoption by individual republics of legislative acts that run counter to Union laws and the declaration of the supremacy of laws from the ground up have led to a disruption of economic links and systems of management. This has had a particularly harmful effect on the consumer market. In the first nine months of the year, unsatisfied demand for food products not only did not fall but on the contrary rose to almost R50 billion.

The problem of supplying the consumer market cannot be resolved without fundamental transformations in agro-industrial production. That is why the government is doing everything in its power to change the prevailing socioeconomic situation in the countryside.

All food-producing enterprises are exempted from wage-fund growth tax, the previously deferred debts of kolkhozes and sovkhozes have been written off, and purchase prices for grain, livestock, poultry, and raw tobacco have been increased. In the system of measures the government is planning to strengthen the rural economy, 1991 occupies a special place. N.I. Ryzhkov cited specific figures on capital investments and material and technical resources that are due to be channeled into agriculture and the processing sectors. It is envisioned that the centralized allocation of the main kinds of machinery, equipment, and construction and other materials will be retained.

Further in his speech, N.I. Ryzhkov dwelt on the fundamental provisions of the transition to the market in the agrarian sphere of the economy. Essentially, this means creating conditions for the efficient functioning of the different forms of economic management and ownership, be it kolkhoz, sovkhoz, agro-industrial combine, agrifirm, or peasant farm. The government's basic premise is that the mass bankruptcy of kolkhozes and sovkhozes cannot be allowed.

The removal of the subsidy on the production of certain types of food remains a serious problem during the transition. It must be borne in mind that even a substantial rise in prices for food will not resolve the subsidy problem. In this regard the government believes that this problem cannot be resolved at a stroke but will take a relatively long time. In this respect the government supports a moderately radical path of transition to the market.

So, the agrarian trade union has acquired a new form. And not only a new form: What is effectively a new structure has been built on the old foundations—a voluntary union of autonomous trade unions from the republics, trade union organizations, associations, and other professional formations. That is what the statutes say. May the renewed union be militant in the struggle for rural workers' rights.

Shcherbakov Cited on Unemployment Prospects

LD1110161690 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—One of the major documents in the package of laws stipulating the Soviet Union's transition to a market economy is the draft fundamentals of legislation by the Soviet Union and Union republics on employment, which was approved by the Soviet parliament in the first reading on Wednesday and commented upon by specialists at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press center today.

Chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Labour and Social Affairs Vladimir Shcherbakov told journalists that the number of unemployed in the country would depend on which plan for the transition was approved by parliament.

If the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy shock-therapy plan is approved, state subsidies to loss-making enterprises will be cut at once, and the number of jobless people will temporarily reach 35 or even 40 million people.

If, however, the more conservative government plan is approved, the number will only reach between eight and ten million.

Of course, he said, the number of the unemployed will be reduced quickly, as the country now has 11 million vacancies and entrepreneurship will continue to develop to take care of surplus work force.

The shock-therapy will leave between eight and ten million people unemployed for a year, while the adoption of the government plan will enable the country to avoid mass unemployment completely.

Shcherbakov stressed the need to create as soon as possible a state employment service having a powerful base for personnel training and retraining.

The realisation of the fundamentals of legislation on employment, Shcherbakov said, will cost the state budget between four and six billion roubles next year alone.

Secretary of the country's trade union headquarters Albert Yakovlev focused on the need to ensure conditions for the free migration of the population and above all for the formation of a free housing market.

Commentary Supports Gorbachev Decrees on Economy

PM1110101790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Commentary by Aleksandr Fedotov under the "What They Are Saying" rubric: "From Knoll to Knoll Across the 'Minefield'"]

[Text] For the second time in only a short period the country's President M.S. Gorbachev has used his legislative authority. The decree on the stabilization of economic links is geared, as we know, to strengthening interaction among enterprises, which has gone wrong and assumed a kind of "Brownian movement." But what about the second decree, on 4 October—"On priority measures on the transition to market relations"?

"To make the 'leap' out of the clinging mire and into the market, you need at least a knoll of firm ground. In this sense the President's decree is a very important knoll on the path to the market."

This metaphor was used to describe the president's step by M.S. Gorbachev's aide N. Petrakov at a meeting with journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center.

I do not know whether the background element in N. Petrakov's comparison—the "mire"—referred to parliament, but I personally "read" the presidential decree as, aside from anything else, a warning against "vacillation." Each new day of uncertainty tightens the "noose" around the neck of an economy that has already been "hanged."

It was not for nothing that the president gave priority treatment to the key issue of pricing, putting in market order the "ceiling" wholesale prices set by the supervisory agencies. Removing the tight command administrative "cap" and setting them free enables industrial enterprises to reach agreement with one another on an acceptable payment for the products that are being made and to trade not in the old, primitive way (you give me hemp, I give you timber), but on the basis of prices formed by the market situation.

The question is: Won't the possibility of contracts, of bargaining bring about a rise in prices that already "hurt"?

The presidential decree restricts profitability levels. All excessive profits will be channeled into the budgets—equal amounts to the Union and republics. Incidentally this, on top of enterprises' increased contributions to the state for social security, will financially reinforce the programs providing for the protection of "defenseless" citizens in the face of the coming market, first and foremost our old people—the pensioners.

Some other restrictions are envisaged to prevent wholesale prices from "galloping away": fixed rates for basic products.

However, the step taken by the president toward the market has not established the market yet. What I mean is that his decree is just a nudge to get things going, to "test" the correctness of the chosen path. That is the way to move through a minefield, to which the current economic situation is readily comparable. And no wonder, in view of the numerous questions motivated by the decree (for example: Is it logical to release wholesale prices and then say nothing about retail prices? Why are we embarking on the path to the market with free prices rather than financial stabilization? In what way will the decree affect the size of the budget deficit? And so on and so forth). USSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman L. Abalkin was forced to explain: The president's decree is an emergency half-measure implying subsequent decisions geared to strengthening the ruble, stabilizing the ruble rate, demonopolizing.... But there is another underlying cause of the emergency—contracts are being concluded and prices must be set right now, not at some vague time in the future.

Admittedly, half-measures are a considerable risk. But in our case it is a risk that justifies the option of moving from "knoll" to "knoll" to get out of the mire. Standing still in the present situation spells disaster.

PRAVDA Readers Question Market Advocates

PM0510141190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[O. Mikheyev report under the "Reader-Newspaper" rubric: "The Art of Loving the Market"]

[Text] For the 10 or 15 minutes before the meeting began the rain came down even harder. But our soaked readers continued pouring into the big party building on Tsvetnoy Boulevard; in the end the hall was full, and the microphones found it hard to cope with the inflamed passions. PRAVDA personnel (the team was headed by chief editor I.T. Frolov) and our readers were talking about the transition to the market.

Of course, the 2,000-strong audience wanted to talk not so much with us as with the authors of the programs for the development of a market economy. But L. Abalkin and N. Petrakov, who had given firm promises that they would be present, were summoned to a conference with the president which dragged on, and in the end they were unable to come.

Nevertheless, in my view, the depleted platform withstood the barrage of questions, deploying such forces as two academicians (O. Bogomolov and I. Frolov), doctors of sciences (PRAVDA's D. Valovoy and Ye. Gaydar, and E. Figurnov from the Presidential Council staff), and a candidate of sciences (V. Grishchenko from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]

Council of Ministers). The latter, incidentally, is one of the authors of the agrarian section of the Shatalin program.

Opinions

The PRAVDA representatives, as the meeting's organizers, and also the academic economists invited to it spelled out their views on the "market question" first. We will cite below a condensed version of what was said from the platform so that all our readers can have a clearer idea about our editorial board's position:

—The main advantage of the so-called Shatalin program or the "500 days" program is that it resulted from an accord between the leaders of the Union and Russia, Gorbachev and Yeltsin. Without cooperation with Russia any efforts by the Union leadership to stabilize the situation today would be doomed to fail.

—The government program is more of a collection of perfectly reasonable wishes and normative enactments, from which it is not clear how the government intends to control the levers of management at the macroeconomic level.

—If you strip the rhetoric from the government program, the remaining "residue"—even after the transition to the market—is a unitarian state with a center whose power, although curtailed, nevertheless remains omnipotent. At the same time the "500 days" program, despite serious shortcomings, takes account of the realities and the growth of republic sovereignty.

—The two programs are incompatible, and attempts to knit them together are a futile waste of time. The "500 days" program should be adopted, with additional work being done on its weak points: for example, the absence of a federal tax, the fantastic scale and rate of privatization, the excessive concessions to republic separatism, the excessive optimism about possible levels of unemployment, inflation, the preservation of living standards, and so forth.

Academician O. Bogomolov spelled out his concept of privatization:

"A process of sharing out property which 'in nationwide terms belongs to nobody' is beginning, with the government considering that this property has never belonged to the people and therefore the population should have to buy it. A proportion of state property must be distributed among the adult population gratis. This would not only be just, it would also create equal starting conditions for people's business activity."

For his part V. Grishchenko, one of the compilers of the "500 days" program, explained to those present the approaches adopted by its authors to the solution of agrarian problems.

"Our countryside today is a social desert. With rare exceptions the people who remain there are people who have become accustomed to 'extracting' what they want from the state. Equipment must be not 'given' but sold to those who are in a position to buy and make efficient use of it—strong farms, that is. Therefore less equipment than the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building authorizes is in fact needed. Agriculture can become the most flourishing sector of our economy if the producers and consumers of its output get together, bypassing centralized state monopoly structures."

Prejudices

Many of the questions from the floor were more like concise indictments. The first to start a dialogue was an unnamed lady who, in her words, was clear about the background and secret objective of the questions under discussion:

"You are taking the country back to capitalism!"

The lady won approbatory applause.

Then the condemnatory questions followed in salvoes.

Historian and journalist Mikhnovich:

"For whom and for what was perestroyka dreamed up? At whose expense are we going to make the transition to the market? At the expense of the least affluent! These five years of chaos have been a deliberately planned phase to pump the national product out of the pockets of the poor into the hands of the rich and the apparatchiks!" (Applause).

After this the chairman asked the audience as a half-joking test to cast votes in turn "for" or "against" the market. Antimarketeers predominated. But the main bulk of people in the hall did not raise their hands. The silent majority patiently observed the discussion. They might have been recalling how well we used to live, picturing a cold and hungry gloom descending over a fatherland put under the hammer, or simply waiting for the movie "The Art of Loving" promised for after the discussion....

But meanwhile the barrage of questions continued.

"When they were compiling the agrarian section did the compilers of the programs consult with kolkhoz [collective farm] members and sovkhoz [state farm] workers? Did these city dwellers set foot in a village, a threshing floor, or even a stockyard?" (Reader Panferov).

"Who needs this market? Doctors and academicians! The workers were not asked or consulted about this! Let their voice be heard in PRAVDA!" (Our reader, worker Desyatov).

"Who palmed off the idea of the market onto the party? If the market program fails the whole blame will fall on the party! The selling off of state enterprises will only strengthen the mafia but will not give anything to honest workers!" (Doctor of Philosophical Sciences and Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Pavlenko).

And so on and so forth.

We are not going to cite here the answers given in the hall to these and other similar questions. A few quick sentences will not convince readers, let alone change their minds. The "antimarketeers" did not like the answers, of course, as was to be expected. The "marketeers," gathering in groups after the meeting, continued the discussion for a long time in foyers, on staircases, in corridors—and theirs was an important and interesting conversation. Meanwhile the silent majority were recovering from the acrimonious exchanges and the ideas expressed about store shelves, prices, shares, and inflation, grabbing sandwiches and immersing themselves in the "Art of Loving."

All Together

The newspaper has made its choice. We are urging readers not backward to a barracks economy but forward to a difficult and unfamiliar but free life worthy of man. We see our task as being not to sing the praises of the compilers of economic projects but to help people to see the strong and weak points in these programs, to tell the truth about what awaits the people under market conditions, to defend the interests of underprivileged strata, and to fight for the free labor of those who are willing and able to work at full capacity. PRAVDA will closely monitor the progress of the reform, seek to promptly detect deviations from the adopted scenario, and suggest how to rectify the situation. And our pages are open to anybody who is sincerely concerned about how to finally overcome the economic crisis, fill the market with goods, and make them accessible to every family.

This was discussed at the meeting by the chief editor and other PRAVDA representatives. Many questions were also asked about the difficult life of the party press in conditions of a hectically developing information market and a situation tantamount to an assault on glasnost permitted by a government which has been unable or unwilling to cope with the galloping increases in the cost of paper and, therefore, newspaper and magazine subscriptions.

As the meeting participants were promised, the editorial board will answer some of the questions in the newspaper. Numerous written notes were handed in, and it was decided to meet with readers again in the second half of October and discuss the newspaper's orientation and content with them.

...The meeting ended. The marketeers, thinking their postdiscussion thoughts, dispersed to their homes. And I struggled through the rain without an umbrella (I had left it in the subway, and just try to buy a new one!) and thought that at home I have no sausage, cheese, potatoes, or many other things dear to my heart and my stomach, and heaven knows where I can buy them....

And I also thought: Is there a limit to our eternal Slav patience? While two camps of economists and their sympathizers are arguing, our patient majority are waiting in line—today it is for bread and tobacco; what will it be tomorrow? But what should be done? The great market breakthrough can only be essayed by all of us together, by the entire people, with their eyes open, understanding where we are heading, agreeing to see it through, and not deluding each other that life will not become more difficult. And the people leading the people must be people who are trusted. As the Poles did when they put together their government of national accord, people grumble but they put up with even shock therapy when they can look at shelves crammed with goods.

It would be good if we could learn from our neighbors not shock therapy but the ability to achieve the entire country's consent to a decisive step. Without this there is absolutely no point in crossing swords over which path to choose. Without this—even if the only correct choice is found—we will grind to a halt at the very first step.

Freightcar Shortage Delays Paper Deliveries

PM1110112590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Oct 90

[Report by M. Klepov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] An acute situation has taken shape at the Perm Pulp and Paper Combine. There are now thousands of tonnes of paper there—paper that is in short supply. So if you suddenly find out that a newspaper or journal has not been published somewhere, you can be sure that it is not sabotage but elementary mismanagement and sloppiness that are to blame for it.

[Klepov] [video shows huge rolls of paper lying in warehouse] Stores, workshops, and passages between the machines are all choked with paper. Moreover, paper is in short supply. This is output which is used to produce packaging. Wallpaper is also lying immobile in the stores and in workshops. Some 1.2 million standard rolls have accumulated—output that is in very short supply. Especially since a very great deal has been done here of late to improve wallpaper quality and boost the yield of the machinery by one-third. It was decided to ask the enterprise leaders to urge the population to buy wallpaper direct from here. The workshops would consequently be clear the next day and the people would be grateful. But the leaders have no authority to do so. What a pity!

[N.V. Zelenin, combine chief engineer] The combine has piled up approximately 3,000 tonnes of finished output. This represents six days' work by the combine. We need more than 150 covered freightcars to remove this output. We have lost 621,000 rubles, plus roughly the same amount in penalties levied by our consumers.

[Klepkov] Have you turned to anyone?

[Zelenin] Yes, I have made several appeals to the leadership of the Sverdlovsk Railroad and to our local authorities with no result. I want to appeal to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of

Ministers, in particular to Comrade Silayev: Help the Perm Pulp and Paper Combine collective so that our output reaches the consumer.

[Klepkov] The same alarming situation has taken shape in other related enterprises in Perm Oblast. The railroad workers have one answer. There are no covered freightcars. They say that they have been dispatched to ship agricultural produce. It cannot be denied that freightcars are needed to bring in the harvest, but they are also needed here. We must ensure that USSR Ministry of Railways planning is more effective.

Sugar Refining Slowed by Inefficiency, Breakdowns

PM1110160390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Oct 90

[Report by G. Klimov and A. Senin from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] You are probably aware, comrades, that in many parts of our capital sugar coupons even for August and September still cannot be redeemed. The situation in other cities of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and other republics is no better. And this despite the fact that the sugar beet crop is good this year. So what is the problem? Here is a reportage by our correspondent from the Ukraine:

[Correspondent] This year the sugar beet sugar content is one percent higher than last year. It would not be worth mentioning this fact if it did not mean many additional tonnes of sugar. The main thing now is not to delay the beet harvest, procurement, and processing.

The Gubinikha sugar refinery processes sugar beets from Dnepropetrovsk and Kharkov Oblast farms. Here they do not divide suppliers into "ours" and "others." They all have to wait in line together, as you can see. [video shows inside of refinery and a long line of laden trucks outside] [passage omitted]

An unloader has broken down, a plant representative explains. It is being dealt with. [video shows faulty unit] The plant representative also complains that truck drivers do not operate according to a timetable. It is true, truck drivers do not have a schedule.

Installation workers carrying out the reconstruction of the Gubinikha sugar refinery, on the other hand, have a detailed schedule, but they are not fulfilling it. After all, it was planned to double the refinery's capacity during the current year. And so the reconstruction drags on. [video shows inside of refinery] The Dneprotyazhstroy Trust complains about the poor quality of design work, about incomplete equipment deliveries, and so on and so forth. The buck is being passed down the line. And everyone exudes optimism, as if there were no waiting lines for sugar in cities and villages.

Timber Enterprise Ends Inefficient Production

PM1110155190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Report by L. Salnikov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] As has already been announced, Altay Kray has been declared a free-enterprise zone. Joint enterprises will play a highly important role there. Our correspondent in Altay Leonid Salnikov will talk about one of the first of them. It is a question of the beginning of changes in the timber industry. This is linked both with ecology and the economy.

[Salnikov] [video shows lumber mill] Operating at a loss and close to bankruptcy, the Biysk sawmill was sold to the Soviet-Maltese enterprise Greenfield. The old mill had been subordinate for many years to one god alone—gross output. The more cubic meters of timber processed and, consequently, felled from the taiga—mainly highly valuable cedarwood, moreover—the better for the mill. But what was the purpose, the reason for this?

[L.G. Yelesakov, joint enterprise director] I can say, for instance, that the Biysk sawmill processed 160,000 tonnes of raw material, top-grade cedarwood, for the production of—what do you think—ordinary chests. So cedarwood was used to produce packaging. [video shows sawmill process]

[Salnikov] The kray has now banned the felling of cedar trees. In conditions of commonsense economics it is those enterprises that produce more useful items from a smaller amount of timber that have a future. Greenfield is beginning to install a British line for the production of high-quality decorated timber products. They will be sold on both the domestic and world markets; naturally, for good money. But the main thing is that a collective which was disintegrating has gotten itself a second wind. It is now a self-recouping enterprise and there can be no question of any subsidies. The enterprise has a secure future both economically and socially. [passage omitted].

Polymer Plant Improves Production on Lease System

PM1110114590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Oct 90

[Report by N. Vidonov, Yu. Kostomarov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer The "Khimprom" production association in Sayanskoye, Irkutsk Oblast, is getting ready for market conditions.

[Reporter] As of the beginning of the current year, no longer relying on anyone else, the production association's workers have been leasing their enterprise, which was by no means a leading enterprise. The labor collective leaseholders, who are now responsible for everything, have boldly embarked on establishing order and discipline, especially in laggard sections. After a short time, last year's production level was exceeded. Another long-awaited event also took place—the enterprise reached its rated capacity in the production of polymers. People realized that working hard is good and it pays. Average wages have doubled. [video shows plant and people at work]

[V.I. Yemelyanov, director general of the association] The first thing we sought to achieve was for the enterprise to be able to distribute its earned income as it saw fit. On the other hand, this system has not given us true independence, because we are bound by rigid agreements with the ministry and rigid contracts with consumers and suppliers.

[Reporter] The polymers produced by the association are a commodity which is in demand in both our own and the external market. Unfortunately, so far they are exported as raw materials. However, within the next few days the first linoleum production unit will go into service here. In the longer term it is hoped to produce all kinds of sheeting, various facing materials, and cable insulation.

While seeking to maintain existing advantageous contacts and connections, the association is at the same time looking for new forms of economic cooperation and reliable partners. It is already a partner in Irkutsk Oblast's first Soviet-American joint venture producing bathroom and lavatory fittings from Sayanskoye resin. Solid profits are expected. Negotiations are under way with several more Soviet and foreign companies on production sharing in the manufacture of goods from polymer materials.

Moscow Television Carries Computer Advertisement

PM1110160190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1937 GMT 5 Oct 90

[From the Commercial Advertisments Break of the "Vzglyad and Other Things" Program]

[Text] The Soviet-U.S. Dialog joint venture offers automated work stations based on the AUTOCAD-10 professional computer-aided drawing and design system. The AUTOCAD-10 system can be used in the most varied spheres and makes it possible to substantially reduce the time needed for design work. High-quality reproduction on paper of the finished designs is possible. The AUTOCAD-10 system is available both in English and Russian. The users of AUTOCAD-10 are offered free service and backup by the Dialog joint venture for two years after signing the contract. [video shows system in action, followed by two notices on the screen which read:]

AUTOCAD-10 115598 Moscow,
Ulitsa Yagodnaya, 17
Dialog joint venture
Tel. 329-41-33

In addition, the Dialog joint venture is marketing a limited batch of PC-AT and PC-XT type personal computers for transferable rubles—payments to be made to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

107066, Moscow,

Spartakovskaya 13.

Tel. 265-62-06

Fax. 265-63-05.

*Increases in Kolkhoz Market Prices

904D0227A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN in Russian No 36, Sep 90 p 12

[Report by A. Zaytseva: "What Costs How Much at the Market: July 1990"]

[Text] **I read in the last issue of your paper, No 35, about the introduction by USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] of a new procedure for calculating the index of retail prices. I wonder how the actual situation looks in the light of these calculations; do these indices reflect the unprecedented price hikes at the kolkhoz [collective farm] markets? After all, for a single carrot they are asking 50 kopecks nowadays... N. Samoylova, Moscow.**

As has already been reported in EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No. 35, starting in 1989, USSR Goskomstat organized calculations of retail price indices based upon the international practice of registering the prices of representative goods. The monthly registration of prices for an assortment of representative goods serves as the basis for calculating such indices, and they take into consideration not only the change in products produced in the reported period and the previous period, but also the influence of the established prices for new products, contract prices, and others. We recall that kolkhoz trade prices are observed for 105 items in 264 cities on a monthly basis.

The composite price index for groceries (counting products sold through state and cooperative trade stores, co-ops, and at the kolkhoz market) in 1989 comprised 100.8 percent by comparison to 1988, and 101 percent for the first half of 1990 by comparison to that same period last year; the index of state retail prices, 100.4 percent and 100.8 percent respectively.

For foodstuffs (excluding alcoholic beverages, whose prices remain stable), 1989 prices rose 1 percent by comparison to 1988, and for the first half of 1990, 1.2 percent compared with the same period in 1989, primarily as the result of the increased prices for potatoes, fruits and vegetables.

Cited below are data on the price changes for potatoes and fruit and vegetables for the first half of 1990:

	State retail prices	City cooperative	Kolkhoz market	Composite price index
1990 1st half given as percent of 1989 1st half				
Potatoes	119.4	81.1	90.1	109.5
Vegetables	105.8	117.6	125.9	109.4
Fruit	110.0	118.6	123.3	113.6

Price indices for some grocery items (including products sold in state trade, city cooperative stores, and kolkhoz market)

	1989 prices in percent of 1988 prices	1990 1st half in percent of 1989 1st half	Sale volume in percent of total volume of goods circulation
Grocery items	100.8	101.0	47.9
Food products	101.0	101.2	35.9
Meat products	99.2	100.1	8.6
Fish products	100.4	100.1	1.4
Animal fat	99.8	100.0	1.5
Vegetable oil	101.2	100.5	0.4
Lard and other edible fats	97.4	103.4	0.1
Margarine and margarine products	100.0	100.0	0.3
Milk and dairy products	99.9	100.2	2.5
Cheese	100.0	100.0	0.4
Eggs	100.0	100.0	1.3
Confectionary	100.0	100.1	3.1
Tea	100.0	100.0	0.6
Sugar	99.6	99.5	1.6
Grain products (flour, meal, pasta, bread products)	100.1	100.1	4.1
Potatoes	110.3	109.5	0.5
Vegetables	105.4	109.4	2.0
Fruit	113.5	113.6	1.9
Alcoholic beverages	100.0	100.4	12.0

In 1989 and the first half of this year there occurred substantial growth in the prices for potatoes, fruits and vegetables in state trade stores as the result of the expansion of the sale of this produce at contract prices. Thus, the situation with fresh cucumber prices in Bryansk, Yaroslavl, Arkhangelsk, Moscow, Lipetsk, Ufa, Pskov, Tyumen, Chita, Petropavlovsk, Tver [Kalinin], Chelyabinsk, and Kirov, where they were 1.2 to 1.4 times higher on 22 June by comparison with that date last year; in Ryazan, Kaluga, Leningrad, Vladivostok, Ivano-Frankovsk, Frunze, Brest, Volgograd, Novgorod, Saransk, Vilnius, Kharkov, Orel, and Vitebsk, from 1.5 to 1.9 times higher respectively; in Astrakhan, Penza, Baku, Kiev, Krivoy Rog, Zaporozhye, Yerevan, Smolensk, Leninakan, Taganrog, and Shakhty, from 2-3 times higher; in Odessa, Izmail, and Batumi, prices have increased 5-fold; fresh tomato prices in Gorkiy, Bryansk, Kursh, Lutsk, Tula, Zaporozhye, Saratov, Mogilev, and Ivanovo have increased 1.2-1.4 fold; in Ulyanovsk, Odessa, Orenburg, Kurgan, Vologda, Novgorod, Baku, Yerevan, Magadan, Vilnius, and Batumi, 1.5-2.0 times higher, and in Leninakan and Kyzyl-Orda, 2.8 and 2.9 times higher respectively.

During this period, potato prices in Kemerovo, Khmelnitskiy, Yaroslavl, Frunze, Tyumen, Yakutsk, Vilnius, Ivano-Frankovsk, Donetsk, Tbilisi, Simferopol, Krasnodar, and Kursk grew 1.4-1.8 fold; in Aktyubinsk, Batumi, Volkhov, Moscow, Chernovtsy, and Sukhumi, 2-3 fold, Yoshkar-Ola and Tula, 4-fold, and Kazan and Novosibirsk, 5-fold.

The growth of prices in state trade, as well as the complicated situation in providing the population with foodstuffs in the first half of the current year has caused genuinely unprecedented price increases in the kolkhoz market, by 18.2 percent by comparison to the corresponding period of last year. There was even more growth in July.

What was the level of prices at the kolkhoz markets in July, for, say, beef?

In July 1990, beef prices were registered at the kolkhoz markets of 217 cities. Within the circle of compared cites in which the prices were registered both in July 1990 and July 1989, prices had risen in 167 of them, fallen in 1, and remained at last year's levels in 28.

By comparison to July 1989, beef prices in July 1990 had increased 34 percent, with the price growth observed in almost all locations. Prices increased by 35-46 percent at the markets in the Central Chernozen, the Northern-Central regions, the Northern Caucasus, Eastern Siberia, the Volga region, the Central region, and by 61 percent at the markets in Armenia.

Overall, the average beef price in the country in July of this year was 7 rubles 30 kopecks per kilogram.

Beef was being sold at over 7 rubles per kilogram at the markets of 57 out of the 217 cities. The highest price level, from 9 rubles to 11 rubles 50 kopecks per kilogram was found at markets of the following cities: Vladimir, Arzamas, Kirov, Kuybyshev, Sochi, Odessa, Riga, Mozhaisk, Tver [Kalinin], Kostroma, Yaroslavl, Chapayevsk, Perm, Sverdlovsk, Vladivostok, Sukhumi, Yerevan, Tyumen, Ivanovo, and Arkhangelsk.

Low prices, from 3 to 4 rubles per kilogram, were registered at the markets of the following cities: Berdichev, Nezhin, Belgrad, Kursk, Chernigov, Kremenchug, Pavlodar, Petropavlovsk, Baranovichi, Kagul, Soroki, and Barabinsk.

At the markets of Moscow and Leningrad the average beef prices in July of this year were 13 rubles 50 kopecks and 15 rubles respectively.

The following table, with values for 1990 in percent of 1989 levels, describes the overall situation with prices at city kolkhoz markets in July:

City Kolkhoz Markets: The Change in Prices

	1990 in percent of 1989	
	January-July	Including July
All agricultural products	121	129
Plant products	121	129
Grain	102	106
—Groats	99.3	105
—Flour	106	121
—Meal	100.1	105
—Legumes	106	105
Potatoes	96	117
—Last year's crop	85	106
—This year's crop	116	118
Vegetables	129	138
—Fresh cabbage	126	134
—Onions	136	143
—Beets	127	128
—Carrots	116	120
—Fresh cucumbers	151	167
—Fresh tomatoes	133	135
—Garlic	91	98
—Scallions	128	127
Fruit	125	129
Vegetable oil	100.4	109
Animal products	120	128
Meat products	121	129
—Beef	125	134
—Lamb	115	120
—Pork	125	134
—Lard	104	106
—Poultry	115	122
Dairy products	112	113
—Milk	107	112
—Animal fats	107	116
—Farmer cheese	113	117
—Sour cream	106	111
Eggs	109	135
Livestock	112	116
Flowers	116	135

Agricultural

Grain Yields Up From 1989; Purchase Rate 'Poor'

PM1110155990 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 Oct 90 p 1

[N. Osychkin article under the rubric "USSR State Committee for Statistics Report": "Fall Calls for Haste"]

[Text] Harvesting continues in the country. According to USSR State Committee for Statistics data, by 8 October 97 million hectares of grain and pulse crops had been threshed on kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms]. Some 4 million hectares of cereals and rice remain to be harvested (taking into account ruined crops), mainly in the Russian Federation. The grain yield is on average 22.1 quintals per hectare, compared with 18.6 quintals at the same time last year. The gross grain harvest (excluding corn) amounts to 214.8 million tonnes—26.6 million tonnes more than in 1989. Some 61.8 million tonnes of grain (72 percent of the state order) have been purchased. By the same time last year 55 million tonnes had been procured. The grain purchase rate remains poor, particularly in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. In the week under review only 2.7 million tonnes of grain arrived at grain-reception centers.

Some 831,000 hectares of grain corn, with a yield of 35.6 quintals per hectare—on a par with last year—have been harvested. A total of 2,962,000 tonnes of grain have been harvested and 552,000 tonnes have been purchased. Some 2 million hectares of sunflowers—44 percent of the crop—have been threshed, with a yield of 17.1 quintals. The soybean harvest is under way in the Far East. The yield is 261 quintals per hectare, compared with 268 last year. Some 34.5 million tonnes of root crops have been purchased, which is 45 percent of the state order. Some 312 sugar refineries are operating and 1.9 million tonnes of sugar have been produced.

Some 6,055,000 tonnes of raw cotton—77 percent of the plan—have been purchased. The Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has fulfilled the state order. The cotton procurement rate is lower than last year in Azerbaijan SSR. Some 535,000 hectares of fiber flax have been pulled—69 percent of the crop. The harvest rate is very low, particularly on farms in the Russian Federation. Some 130,000 tonnes of flax fiber have been purchased—31 percent of the order.

The vegetable harvest is slow—only 61 percent of the crop. The potato harvesting situation is no better. Some 1.7 million hectares of potatoes have been harvested—75 percent of the crop. Each hectare yields 107 quintals, compared with 118 last year.

Winter crops have been sown on 30.7 million hectares. Fall plowing has been carried out on 49.4 million hectares. This work is markedly slower than last year.

Fall is urging the farmers to hurry up!

City Dwellers Help With Bryansk Potato Harvest

PM1010135990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent I. Pyrkh under the "Harvest-90" rubric: "No Work Found"]

[Text] Bryansk Oblast—On Sunday approximately 20,000 city people, not to mention rural working people themselves, were working in Bryansk Oblast's vegetable and potato fields. Potatoes were harvested from an area of 3,500 hectares during the day. Tubers still have to be lifted on 26,000 hectares, while the entire potato area in the oblast covers 91,000 hectares. Given a week of good weather, the potato and vegetable harvest will be completed.

However, it is not bad weather alone that is hindering the harvest. There is more than enough muddle, disorganization, and slipshodness. Last Friday working people from Bryansk Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] departments traveled to the Leninets Kolkhoz [Collective Farm] in Bryanskiy Rayon. There were 28 of them. They were set to cutting cabbages. They approached this work assiduously. By noon they had cut approximately 15 tonnes of cabbages and loaded five trucks. But they were not given any more work after midday. They literally begged to cut cabbages and lay them in clamps, or to lift potatoes by hand in a neighboring field, or to pull carrots. They were not given permission. Kolkhoz Chairman A. Vorontsov was not to be found either in his office or outside. The team leader essentially threw the gorispolkom workers out, sending them back to the city. I was given this depressing news by A. Amelin, deputy of the oblast soviet and jurist of Bryansk Gorispolkom, who telephoned the correspondent's center.

Anatoliy Fedorovich was also indignant at the fact that, at the oblast soviet session which began 3 October and which was suspended at the suggestion of aforementioned Kolkhoz Chairman A. Vorontsov in connection with the emergency harvest situation, the latter had accused the city people of being to blame for almost everything. He sounded off, as it were, but did not think himself about organizing the matter properly. Strange though it may seem, it is fashionable to accuse city people today. But what of the agricultural leaders themselves? Alas, cases like the one on the Leninets Kolkhoz are far from isolated.

Rail Transport Problems Hamper Vegetable Delivery

PM1110141390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 9 Oct 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by A. Kozhukhova, G. Zemtsov]

[Text] [Announcer] This year, month after month, railroad workers have been failing to fulfill the plan for the transportation of agricultural produce, largely because this produce is not being delivered to them. But these are, after all, perishable goods. The situation with food deliveries and storage of vegetables for the winter is particularly bad at the Moscow and Leningrad railroad junctions.

[Correspondent] Since around 20 September some 200 freightcars of sugar have been arriving in Moscow daily. But unloading is proceeding very slowly. Let us hope that our sugar coupons dating back to last summer will not become invalid.

As for deliveries of fruit, vegetables, and potatoes, the situation has improved slightly during September, since everything arriving in the capital today is going directly to stores, bypassing the depots. Only beets have been delivered in sufficient quantity. Carrots and onions are expected from Central Asia.

We have already reported that it was planned this season to transport more than 17 million tonnes of this year's harvest to various parts of the country. However, we have been disappointed by the Ministry of Railways. Judging by appearances, this figure was unrealistic, just like the expected mass deliveries of potatoes to Moscow from Bryansk, Smolensk, Ryazan, and other nearby oblasts. Whereas this time last year thousands of freightcars were waiting to be unloaded at the Moscow and

Leningrad railroad junctions, this year poor use is being made of the freightcars assigned for potato transportation. The Ochakovo-1 station in Moscow Oblast, for instance, was crowded with agricultural produce trains last year. And today?

[N.A. Saprykin, deputy chief Moscow Railroad freight service] These sidings [points to empty railroad tracks] are meant for freightcars delivering potatoes and vegetables to local associations. But they are deserted. The picture at other stations that serve fruit and vegetable depots is the same. According to information from the Moscow Main Administration for Fruit and Vegetable Storage, so far only 11 percent of potatoes have been laid in. This time last year it was already 69 percent. Regarding vegetable storage this year, it totals 33 percent against 56 percent this time last year.

[Announcer] So this is the situation. As usual, there is a shortage of refrigerated freightcars. The shortage of this type of rolling stock is most acute. Meanwhile at Vladykino, Moskva-Tovarnaya, Kurskaya, and Kuskovo there are refrigerated freightcars that arrived from Turkmenia with fruit, vegetables, and melons for the Moscow fall fair as long as ago as 22-24 September. They have still not been unloaded and are being used as refrigerators on wheels. Very expensive refrigerators indeed! The railroad workers' mismanagement and procurement workers' irresponsibility are simply amazing!

Agricultural Developments 27 Sep-8 Oct Reported

LD0910005990

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 27 September-8 October, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

27 September

According to State Committee for Statistics, Goskomstat, data, cotton growers of Uzbekistan have picked over 2 million tonnes of cotton. It took only five days to pick the second million tonnes. (0800)

28 September - 2 October

No significant developments reported.

3 October

Uzbekistan: 3 million tonnes of cotton have been taken in to date. (0700)

4 October

Approximately half a million tonnes of raw cotton has been picked in Tajikistan. Kirghizia sold 66,000 tonnes of raw cotton so far. (1400)

Grain has been harvested on 92 percent of the areas sown. Around 2 million hectares will remain unharvested. Here the crops were lost for various reasons. Despite large losses arising from a shortage of material and technical resources and poor organization, 22.2 quintals per hectare were obtained countrywide. The best harvest of grain was in the Ukraine, which registered almost 37 quintals per hectare. State orders were fulfilled by Georgia, Azerbaijan, Stavropol Kray—altogether, nine Russian oblasts, two in the Ukraine, four oblasts in Belorussia, and Uralsk Oblast in Kazakhstan. Rostov Oblast gave the state 1 million tonnes of grain above the state order, and can supply almost 250,000 tonnes more, but only for material and technical resources. Vegetable and particularly potato harvesting is going very slowly. Mass harvesting has come to the sugar beet and sunflower fields. Again there is a shortage of gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricants. This is also the reason for the delay in the sowing of winter crops and fall plowing. (1600)

5-6 October

No significant developments reported.

7 October

Kazakhstan: To date, 11 million tonnes of grain has been delivered to the state. The republican minister of grain products reports that the republic plans to sell another 6 million tonnes of grain to the state. (Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0200 GMT)

Poultry-farming is the country's most stable agricultural sector. However it has now reduced production for the first time. In the first nine months of the year, there was a shortfall in supplies of almost 2 billion eggs. This has had an immediate impact on customers in Moscow and Leningrad, where eggs have disappeared from sale. Their market price in Moscow has reached 10 rubles and more for 10. According to the general director of Soyuzptitseprom, the reason for the deficit lies in the shortage of high-quality compound feeds, which has forced poultry factories to reduce the numbers of laying hens. (0900)

8 October

No significant developments reported.

Military

Yazov Accused Over Coup-Rumor 'Exercises'

PM1210112390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 90 p 1

[Letter from Soviet Army Air Force Major M. Pustobayev published under the heading "What People Write to Us From the Army"; last paragraph is editorial note]

[Text] Extreme circumstances and outrage at the biased presentation on the airwaves and in the press of events which I have witnessed and taken part in have forced me to write this letter.

The unit in which I serve received a dispatch 9 September 1990 ordering it to assume readiness to fly a mission. We proceeded quietly and without fuss, just as we did on 12 December 1979, when we were also put on alert prior to rendering "international assistance" to Afghanistan. Toward evening subunits of Airborne Troops in combat gear—steel helmet, flak jacket, weapons and ammunition allowance—boarded the aircraft. In addition combat hardware, personnel transports, and the task force's combat machines were also loaded.

The flight crew were ordered to fly to Ryazan, but two hours before takeoff the order was changed, and between 0100 and 0600 hours of 10 September we were flown to a Moscow Oblast airfield located west of Moscow. Before takeoff it became known that the task force and equipment would not be disembarked at the destination airfield until an order to this effect was received.

The idea that this might be an exercise never occurred to those flying toward Moscow. All the conversations among the flight crew were about the situation in Moscow being uneasy and about possible disturbances in the capital in connection with the opening of the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

The immediate command was also in a state of ignorance as to the objective of the airlift of our group. The task force which had been forbidden even to alight from the aircraft after landing was subsequently told to disembark without unloading the equipment and set up camp in a wood next to the airfield, which it was also forbidden to leave unless ordered to do so. The airmen settled down in the aircraft.

After 34 hours our group was flown to an airfield in Bryansk Oblast. At both airfields the local command learned about our arrival only one hour before our landing. Finally, 13 September, our group arrived in Pskov for disembarkation of the Airborne Troops personnel. During the entire period from 9 through 13 September none of those involved in the airlifts in Moscow Oblast had any idea about the objective of these maneuvers.

Only someone who is totally unfamiliar with the Army and imagines that all military personnel, even at home, sleep in steel helmets and flak jackets can credit that these were exercises. I must explain: All exercises are scheduled a year ahead in every unit which is to take part in them. Troops usually begin to prepare for defense minister's exercises and maneuvers two to three months before they are due. Furthermore, the objective of the exercises is always given, units are set tasks, and staffs draw up maps pinpointing the tactical situation and so forth.

The peculiarity of these "exercises" consists in the fact that the map, objective, and task were known only to the minister and those to whom he specified them. The personnel learned about their participation in the "maneuvers" from press articles and television only a week after they had ended. In addition, during my 15 years of service in the Soviet Army I have personally taken part in several exercises in close cooperation with units of the Airborne Troops, including "Comradeship in Arms-80," "West-81," "Shield-82," and so forth, but on none of these exercises were live cartridges issued (except for those connected with establishing order in areas of interethnic conflicts).

It would be interesting to know what training objective was rehearsed in the course of these "exercises." Was it embarkation and disembarkation, spending a night in the woods or on an aircraft, or carrying out a secret airlift. An amazing lack of confidence on the part of the command in units with extensive combat experience (Afghanistan, Karabakh, Yerevan, Tbilisi, Fergana, Osh) to carry out such, frankly speaking, elementary tasks. In any event, according to my nonprofessional estimates, the said measures must have cost approximately 1.5 million of the people's rubles of which there is such a shortage. (Apart from our group, another group of exactly the same composition was flown to a Ryazan airfield and subsequently to the southwest of Moscow and, just like us, they sat around in ignorance until 13 September). And this is not counting the deployments of the Tula airborne division.

What about the story about participating in a parade? Why should those taking part in preparations for a parade need steel helmets, flak jackets, arms, and ammunition? It seems to me that the site chosen for the preparations was not exactly appropriate either—woods and heavy rain for a day and a half.

Now about helping with the harvest. Show me one kolkhoz [collective farm] in Moscow, Bryansk, Ryazan, or Kaluga Oblast where anyone of the thousands of people who took part in the aforesaid measures helped agricultural workers in any way at all. There is no such kolkhoz! Our entire group was in a state of one-hour readiness to move out.

Everything that has been said makes it possible to conclude that Minister of Defense Yazov is deliberately refusing to clarify the situation. In this connection I am asking the Supreme Soviet to start an independent deputies' investigation of this matter.

Otherwise these events will have the most negative consequences both in the Army and in the country as a whole. In any case, the personnel who took part in this operation feel that they have been humiliated from high above. People must be confident that the military executes rather than discusses orders. But the person who has issued an order must honestly answer for himself at any level and bear responsibility for the order he has issued.

[Signed] Soviet Army Air Force Major M. Pustobayev (Leningrad Military District)

Shchit Leader Disputes Yazov on Troop Movements

LD1010133290 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 5 Oct 90

["Publication of the Day" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] [First announcer] Publication of the Day is the next feature in our program. We present you with an interview by Vitaliy Urazhtsev, Russia people's deputy and cochairman of the Shchit Union, to the SOBESEDNIK weekly. The reason this material turned up was a discussion that spread in our country's legislature last week in connection with the September troops movement around Moscow. In the foreword to this interview there is an editorial commentary on what the organization Shchit is.

According to its leaders, the foundations of the union for social protection of servicemen, reservists, and members of their families were laid down in 1982. A constituent congress took place in December 1989. Its strength is about 10,000 members. Up to 80 percent of the members are secret. What is the reason? Officers are dismissed from the Army for taking part in this organization's activity. Some 1,000 officers have been driven out of the armed forces for political reasons since the union's existence. By the way, this was actively used at first, after the foundation of Shchit, by young officers who were blocked from leaving the army. Now, as informed by the leaders of Shchit, the majority of the organization's members joined its ranks to prevent the use of the armed forces by the party hierarchy against its own people, to defend the rights and freedoms of servicemen, and to get rid of the institutionalized slavery, bullying, and corruption in the army. A correspondent of the weekly met Colonel-in-reserve Vitaliy Urazhtsev, cochairman of Shchit and Russian people's deputy, the day after the refutation of the defense minister's words in the parliament.

[Second announcer] We hold our ground, said Urazhtsev. It was not an exercise. The facts given by Sergey Kudinov, head of the political department of Ryazan airborne troops military school and Ryazan Oblast soviet people's deputy, are fully in accordance with reality. He has been a member of our organization for three years. We are forced to uncover Colonel Kudinov only due to the extraordinary situation that has arisen. The fact of transferring the troops and hardware to Moscow is also confirmed, for instance, by a pilot of the military transport aviation that, before 16 September, airlifted subunits of Pskov Airborne Division. It is difficult to talk about the trustworthiness of Yazov's speech if he is not even slightly honest. The minister, for example, called Kudinov a member of the General Party of Russia while he is still a member of the Communist Party. By the way, Kudinov has already been dismissed from his position for violating the status of a people's deputy. And what about a map produced by the deputy? I could draw one like this overnight.

[First announcer] Can you tell us, though, in what other way Colonel Kudinov should have acted if his military school was led to Moscow to seize power? That was the next question.

[Second announcer] He simply has done everything to stop the transfer. If a decent officer is ordered to shoot people, he should not do it.

[First announcer] What, in your opinion, was the reason for these movements?

[Second announcer] It is not the first event of the sort, Vitaliy Urazhtsev noted—the same happened in February this year. I think it is connected with the party hierarchy's fear, [word indistinct] only the negative information is filtered and the system scares itself. It seems to them that the day of reckoning for 73 years of anti-national dictatorship is just about to come. An anticommunist phantom frightens them. Meanwhile, the CPSU leadership, which still directs the KGB, the Army, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, cannot help knowing that democrats object to violence in principle. We are told that Shchit allegedly forms fighting detachments. What nonsense! The backbone of Shchit consists of junior officers, company and batallion commanders, [word indistinct], and soldiers—those who will have to stop the units when destructive forces try to make the situation unstable, not to begin rifle tyranny if they receive an order to go against the people.

[First announcer] The Ministry of Defense, however, claims it has no plans to introduce martial law in the country, the journalist noted.

[Second announcer] I can tell you, as an officer who has been working for the Ministry of Defense for almost 10 years, that such plans have always existed in case of extraordinary circumstances. There were no exercises carried out, according to them, in practice earlier on—that is another matter. But now we have a lot of reports from the military district and [word indistinct] about the exercises that have taken place, said deputy Urazhtsev.

[First announcer] Where do you get your information from [words indistinct]?

[Second announcer] There is not a single secret directive that we would not know about. We have a sufficient number of sympathizers of democracy, including generals, in Yazov's circle as well. In time, as in the case with Kudinov, the country will find out their names, said Vitaliy Urazhtsev.

[First announcer] How do you assess the present situation in the Army? That was the last question asked by the SOBESEDNIK correspondent.

[Second announcer] It is impossible to drag out the military reform for decades, as Yazov proposes. There are two dangers: a spontaneous riot and a military coup. It is no coincidence that on 24 September, 43 Russian people's deputies called on the country's servicemen to be vigilant in a situation when attempts to use the Army for political purposes are probably, to manifest courage, self-control, and efficiency, and not to allow the use of arms against the people. I think if the situation develops according to the present-day scenario, Russia will have to think not only about creating its own Ministry of Defense, but also about its own national army to ensure internal security, sovereignty, and the normal march of democratic reforms, Vitaliy Urazhtsev believes.

Chief of Staff Reports Draft Evasion Figures

PM0510133990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 3

[INTERFAX report: "Evasion of Army Draft"]

[Text] In an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent Colonel General Dmitriy Grinkevich, chief of staff of the Ground Forces, reported that because of difficulties with the draft to the ranks of the Armed Forces the personnel shortfall is in excess of 400,000. The main reason is the local soviets' failure to observe legislation affecting the draft and also the adoption in a number of republics of illegal acts encouraging young people's nonfulfillment of their constitutional duties to defend the USSR. The lowest draft level is in the Armenian republic—7.5 percent—while in Georgia the figure is 28 percent and in the Baltic republics about 50 percent. The majority of oblasts of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Azerbaijan have completely fulfilled their draft norms. Criminal proceedings have begun to be used more widely for draft evasion. In Moscow alone 462 such cases have been initiated on the basis of the spring draft. But in the opinion of Colonel General Grinkevich you cannot resolve the question by such measures—the state organs and republican, oblast, and rayon soviets must pay serious attention to the problem.

Sale of MiG-29's to Iran, From Germany Examined

LD0610115190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2252 GMT 5 Oct 90

[From the "Television News Service" progam]

[Text] [Announcer] During recent times, in connection with the crisis in the Persian Gulf, much is again being said in the world about the arms trade. The most unexpected reports are appearing, including some connected with our country. Especially for evening news—Mikhail Osokin:

[Osokin] Much has already been said about the fact that Iraq has MiG-29s. But, last week details also appeared about the sale of such aircraft to neighboring Iran. According to a report by the American agency AP, the agreement was signed in June, and Iran bought 14 aircraft on the condition that they would be equipped with the latest electronics. Tehran television has already shown MiG-29s with Iranian insignias. In particular, much has been said about arms in the Persian Gulf region, but the most interesting report on MiGs has not come from there. [video shows GDR People's Army on parade and more footage of aircraft in the air]

Here are pictures which are already history—the GDR People's Army. Its disappearance promises surprising adventures for the aircraft produced in the Soviet Union. The FRG has started to speak about plans to sell them, and interest has already been expressed by a number of experts from Switzerland and by high-ranking Swedish military men. The U.S. pilot training center has expressed its intention to acquire a MiG-29. However, not everything will be sold. As has already been announced in FRG Government circles, some of the MiGs will become Bundeswehr arms.

In general, our military has been persuaded that the most unusual variants are possible, even with regard to longstanding allies. Against this background, the supply of MiG-29s now to Iran, which during recent years has at times had far from the most friendly relations with us, looks all the more unexpected. Who else may turn out to have MiGs tomorrow?

It seems that new surprises are not only awaiting us in connection with fighters. One of the surprises is possible in Bulgaria. According to U.S. newspapers reports, President Zhelev has invited specialists from the United States to Bulgaria to dismantle eight SS-23 missiles received from the Soviet Union in 1986. Admittedly, the longstanding interest of the Americans in the construction of these missiles will not be fully satisfied because the SS-23s were handed over to Bulgaria without nuclear warheads.

Soldiers Kill Eight in Crimea 'Shooting Spree'

LD1010145190 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 10 TASS—Three soldiers guarding military depots in the area of Feodosiya, in the Crimea, went on a shooting spree on Tuesday killing eight other guards and wounding one. The Soviet Defence Minister press centre announced the deaths today.

Having seized three submachine guns, a pistol and ammunition, the criminals escaped.

As a result of measures undertaken by military control bodies and the Interior Minitry, two men were detained and two submachine guns confiscated.

A third man is still at large.

A investigation is under way.

Units Withdrawn From CSFR Face Housing Problem

PM0510140190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Colonel P. Chernenko report: "Heading Home"]

[Text] Tomorrow, 6 October, the last subunit of the tank division under the command of Major General V. Kuznetsov will leave Czechoslovakia. Thus not a single Soviet tank division will be left on CSFR territory.

When we arrived at Milovice station, from which the last tank train will leave for the USSR, work was in full swing.

"The tanks have already been loaded," Guards Lieutenant Colonel P. Zakharov, commander of the tank battalion and chief of the train, told us. "Now we are bringing the wheeled vehicles onto the flatcars...."

"The mood of the men is normal," Guards Captain S. Bondarenko, deputy commander of the battalion's political unit, chipped in. "Although it has to be said that we are being transferred to places which are by no means fully prepared to receive us: There is no housing for the officers' and warrant officers' families, there are great difficulties with schools and kindergartens.... We will have to begin from scratch, so to speak. There are some in the subunit who have requested a transfer to the reserves."

Unfortunately, for the servicemen in the groups of forces who are returning to the Soviet Union, housing is the number one problem. Even now, seven months after the troop withdrawal began, the situation has changed little. The newspapers carry reports about the many agreements reached and measures being implemented, but when it comes down to specific officers and specific units, it is all far from simple.

There are considerable difficulties ahead for the tank crews. But for the time being there is plenty of work at the station to do. They are loading not just tanks and property but also construction materials.

"We are trying to relocate to the new site with the minimum of material losses," Guards Lieutenant Colonel N. Tsvetkov, regimental commander, told us. "We know that we are going to what is virtually empty ground so we are taking with us things that would be dumped here."

We emphasize that point deliberately. Some commanders are not showing themselves to be thrifty masters.

...The last vehicle has been moved onto the flatcar. Property has been distributed and secured in the freight cars. The engine sounds its whistle and the train moves off.

Each day trains head east from Czechoslovak territory. The withdrawal of the Soviet troops is proceeding strictly according to schedule.

Military Training of Foreigners Curtailed

LD1110132490 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 11 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Anna Shcherbakova]

[Text] Leningrad October 11 TASS—Servicemen from Germany, Hungary and Vietnam will not after all attend studies at the Budenniy Communications Academy in Leningrad. Virtually all 12 military educational establishments in the city where foreigners study will cut the number of cadets in the new academic year.

Thousands of foreign cadets have studied at Soviet military schools and academies. Fees for training skilled specialists for foreign armies were small, which was prompted by political considerations.

The Soviet president's "decree on changes in the foreign economic practices of the Soviet Union" of July 25, 1990 provides for making settlements with the member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in hard currency and at world prices.

The decree notes that economic aid should be given, taking into account the USSR's posibilities. The monthly cost of one cadet's studies at a military educational establishment amounts, on average, to 1,500 U.S. dollars.

Over 1,000 servicemen from 29 countries are now studying in Leningrad military academies and schools. Bulgaria, Angola, and Afghanistan are responsible for the greatest number of cadets.

The grants of foreign cadets at Soviet military schools are ten times as high as those of Soviet cadets. They are also better accommodated at dormitories.

New contracts on training foreign servicemen at Soviet military educational establishments are to be concluded early in 1991. Countries that do not have hard currency for this purpose will be forced to recall their cadets.

Further on 3 Oct Armed Forces Unions Congress

PM0510144590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" report: "Constituent Congress"]

[Text] The Constituent Congress of the Federation of USSR Armed Forces Workers and Employees Unions opened at the M.V. Frunze Central House of the Soviet Army on 3 October.

The report on the organization of the Federation of Armed Forces Workers and Employees Unions was delivered by Organizing Committee Chairman G. Bashtanyuk, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

Army General V. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, made a speech in which he expressed the hope that the congress, which unites Army and Navy trade union organizations, will make a great contribution to strengthening the social protection of workers and employees.

Congress delegates were addressed by Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, USSR defense minister.

Taking part in the work of the congress are Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and Colonel General N. Chekov, USSR deputy defense minister for construction and the billeting of troops.

Defense Official Interviewed on Arms Quality

91UM0005A Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Sep 90 p 3

[Interview with Army General V. Shabanov, USSR deputy minister of defense for armaments, by TRUD special correspondent Yu. Lebedev; place and date not given: "Conversion and Quality of Armament"]

[Text] [Lebedev] Vitaliy Mikhaylovich, the USSR minister of defense has emphasized the need for raising the qualitative parameters of the USSR Armed Forces at a time when they are being reduced. Will this lead not to a new arms race, only this time in the qualitative sphere?

[Shabanov] When we are planning the quality improvement of armaments under conditions of a quantitative reduction in USSR Armed Forces personnel and arms, we are talking about improving weapons for exclusively defensive purposes. This is what the materialization process of our defensive military doctrine constitutes, and it will not lead to an arms race in the quality sphere.

As the history of weapons development shows, the main substantive reason for an arms race consisted of scientific, technical, and technological breakthroughs in the creation of offensive strike weapons. An example of this can be seen in the development by U.S. scientists in the mid-40's of the atomic bomb, a weapon of unprecedented yield at that time, equivalent to an explosion of 20,000 tons of TNT.

The creation of the atomic bomb was without a doubt the main reason for the arms race in the postwar period. And we note that it took courage and wisdom on the part of state, political, and military leaders of the great powers of the second half of the 1980's in order to begin practical disarmament efforts in the nuclear sphere. The new political thinking on problems of war and peace, initiated by our country, facilitated to a decisive degree termination of the "cold war" and the beginning of a reduction in all varieties of armament, primarily nuclear arms.

It must be said, however, that in the leading atomic laboratories of the United States—in Los Alamos, Livermore, and elsewhere—efforts to qualitatively improve nuclear weapons continue. And so we see increased expenditures for nuclear weapons and atomic technology in the United States and endless nuclear test explosions at a range in Nevada. According to estimates by the Institute for the United States and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences, U.S. expenditures in constant 1982 prices for nuclear weapons in 1986-1990 increased by 37.5 percent as compared with the period 1981-1985. The draft U.S. military budget shows expenditures for nuclear weapons for 1991 increasing by 12.5 percent as compared with 1990. These figures say a great deal.

We still do not have specific data concerning a qualitative breakthrough in third-generation American nuclear weapons, but intensive efforts are underway, apparently, with a broad range of actual nuclear explosions.

Certainly we are attentively following these efforts, but our cessation of underground nuclear bursts at the Semipalatinsk testing ground limits our opportunities for experimentally verifying the data we have at our disposal on the American testing.

Thus, the chief danger of a potential arms race in the quality sphere, in my view, may be discoveries by scientists and their implementation in new varieties of third-generation nuclear weapons. I believe we must find an international mechanism for preventing this process.

[Lebedev] Are you not afraid that the process of converting defense branches of industry may have a negative influence on the quality of military production?

[Shabanov] This process has begun being implemented on a systematic basis. It takes into account the programs we have of arms development and production under conditions of reducing the Armed Forces, their armament, and allocations for defense.

A draft of the state conversion programs has presently been drawn up and submitted to the government. It charts an entire set of organizational, technical, economic, and social measures directed toward reorienting a portion of the scientific-technological potential of branches of defense from military to civilian production.

By 1995 it is envisaged that 422 industrial enterprises producing military output will be converted. Of these, 56 will be completely converted to civilian production in the next three years, while the production of arms and military equipment at the remainder will be substantially reduced.

The program also envisages not only the retention of the highly qualified cadre, unique equipment, and the experimental base at enterprises which will now be engaged in nondefense production, but also the further development of their scientific-production capacities. Scientific-technological achievements in the defense sector of industry will be transferred to civilian branches. The remainder of the enterprises will continue their production of armaments and military equipment, but in significantly reduced volume, while taking into account the requirements presented by the USSR Ministry of Defense for arms development and production.

Thus, conversion of the defense industry should not have a negative effect on the quality of military production.

Leningrad Military District Officer Interviewed

AU1010171690 Zagreb DANAS in Serbo-Croatian 25 Sep 90 p 55

["M.L." Report on interview with Major General Vladislav Lisovskiy, deputy commander of the Leningrad Military District; place and date not given: "I Trust the President"]

[Text] Major General Vladislav Lisovskiy is the deputy commander of the Leningrad Military District. He was born in Habarovsk and has completed the highest Soviet military schools, a tank military school, and a military academy. Between the ranks of lieutenant and colonel he was in the famous Kantermirovskaya Division. He also worked as an adviser in Syria and was in the service in the Ukraine. His son is an officer, a major, and is presently stationed in the Ukraine.

[M.L.] Comrade General, what is your view about socialism and communism?

[Lisovskiy] This is difficult to explain in a few words. There have been successes as well as mistakes in the work of us Communists. I still believe that the situation in our country will improve, that socialism will correct its mistakes, and that we will be on our feet again. I find it hard as a Communist to look at the situation in my country. I do not know, perhaps I am conservative. I do not know....

[M.L.] The Soviet press has been writing about various problems in the Soviet Army. The question of soldiers losing their lives is also being raised.

[Lisovskiy] You know, people get killed everywhere. How many people get killed in traffic accidents a year, and yet newspapers do not make any fuss about it. Of course, we do not like it when soldiers get killed. We are trying to reduce such cases to the minimum. However, soldiers also go on leave and traffic accidents do happen. They are all counted as cases of soldiers being killed while in the Army. In addition, accidents in the Army are also a question of culture, the general conduct of the soldiers. The Army cannot change these during the soldiers' service. One more thing, the Army is not a kindergarten. This is a serious institution in which people handle weapons.

[M.L.] OGONEK often criticizes the Soviet Army.

[Lisovskiy] OGONEK has not been objective for a long time when it comes to Army topics. It writes tendentiously, only bad things about the Army. Unfortunately, this is now fashionable.

[M.L.] But experts like Arbatov also used to write about Army problems in OGONEK.

[Lisovskiy] Arbatov is only a theoretician who is not very familiar with practice. Practice, Army reality, is something completely different.

[M.L.] Has the Warsaw Pact ceased to exist?

[Lisovskiy] This military alliance is practically dead.

[M.L.] What is your view on the unification of Germany? To what extent will it be a military threat to the Soviet Union? What is your view about the future German army?

[Lisovskiy] I will gladly tell you about the German Army. You know, even before the two Germanys had excellent armies. The future joint army will probably be an excellent combination. As regards a threat, this is a long story, but I can tell you that the Soviet Union also has strong Armed Forces.

[M.L.] Who is, in your opinion, better for the post of the defense minister, a soldier or a civilian?

[Lisovskiy] Military matters should primarily be tackled by the head of the General Staff, who is always a professional officer. Regarding the post of defense minister, this is a political-military post.

[M.L.] A professional Army in the Soviet Union, yes or no?

[Lisovskiy] Perhaps in the future, in five to six years. Not at the moment. Look at the map and the size of our country. Who could pay for all these professional soldiers? However, I have, of course, a very high opinion of professional attitudes toward work.

[M.L.] You served in the Urals under General Makashov. Not so long ago he criticized President Gorbachev very sharply.

[Lisovskiy] General Makashov is an excellent officer.

[M.L.] The Soviet Army has adopted a new doctrine of reasonable sufficiency. How is this policy being carried out in, for instance, the artillery division such as this one?

[Lisovskiy] Artillery batteries used to have six 152-millimeter weapons. Now they only have four of them.

[M.L.] Only the USSR and the PRC have artillery divisions in their armies. Is this not an obsolete type of division?

[Lisovskiy] We needed them in the past, their role is now disappearing. You are right.

[M.L.] Will you allow the founding of the Armenian National Army?

[Lisovskiy] No, the president and the Supreme Soviet will not permit this either. I hope that they will not allow it.

[M.L.] How do you feel when you know that the media in the West are writing about "the disintegration of the Soviet empire?"

[Lisovskiy] I am 55 and have seen and experienced many things. Everybody has the right to call the Soviet Union what they want, but it is the people who will have the final word.

[M.L.] But will they?

[Lisovskiy] They never had it in the past, nor did the Army.

[M.L.] Do you trust your supreme commander, President Gorbachev?

[Lisovskiy] Yes, I trust the president.

Access to Test Range on Novaya Zemlya Examined

91UM0011A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Oct 90 First Edition p 4

[Article by Captain 3d Rank V. Maryukha, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "Those Who Established the Procedures for Novaya Zemlya—Rejoinder to a Rejoinder"]

[Text] On 24 September of this year IZVESTIYA published the material by V. Filippov "Old Procedures on Novaya Zemlya." It discussed the fact that Yu. Guskov, chairman of the Arkhangel Oblast Soviet, was compelled to postpone his visit to Novaya Zemlya because of the fact that Rear Admiral V. Gorev refused to receive journalists traveling with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy. Referring to the opinion of Major General A. Koltunov, another RSFSR people's deputy, V. Filippov advised that the chief of the test range, as before, does not want to take upon himself the resolution of problems associated with Novaya Zemlya.

Apparently the IZVESTIYA correspondent did not take enough pains to look into the situation that had developed. Because the refusal to receive a delegation with such a composition was inevitable, and Rear Admiral V. Gorev did not have the right to assume authority he did not have.

The fact is, as it was explained to me in the Main Staff of the Navy, expropriation of the territory of the Novaya Zemlya archipelago for the needs of the Ministry of Defense was implemented on the basis of a USSR Council of Ministers decree. Today military control, which applies to everyone, is in effect on this territory.

In accordance with instructions currently in force (which, of course, are firm for the military command of the test range), admission to the archipelago by outsiders is restricted. The exceptions are people's deputies of the country and of the RSFSR who have a right to be on the test range without special permission being issued by the General Staff, but only on administrative territory. As for the references to the fact that instructions on admission procedures stipulate the right of the test range chief personally to make the decision, then the quote in IZVESTIYA, attributed to Major General A. Koltunov, to put it mildly was not written in full. In the words of Captain 1st Rank V. Fedorov, deputy chief of one of the departments of the Main Staff of the Navy, the end of it reads like this: "only under emergency situations where there was a threat to people's lives."

Other premises of the journalist and his interlocutor are also not indisputable. Of course, it would be possible to establish an island soviet of people's deputies, but under the state of affairs existing today more resources would be spent on its support than on the resolution of the everyday problems of the "nonuniformed" population of the archipelago. If industry is developed on the island and a local budget is formed from taxes on enterprises, as IZVESTIYA proposes, then the best thing of all would be to build, well, for example, a mint. No matter what the coins were stamped from, they would be worth their weight in gold on the mainland. So it is hardly likely that the military will help in this. Just as with the installation of telephones on the Arkhangel land with the help of communications satellites, an agreement about which was allegedly reached with the command of the Plesetsk spaceport. One would think that the military has its own satellites and rockets, which they independently launch into outer space at the request of local authorities.

The nuclear test range on Novaya Zemlya has been silent for almost two years. What its future will be does not depend on the military, as some people would like to think. Decisions are made at the state level.

Journalist Visits Novaya Zemlya Test Range

91UM0004A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 3 Oct 90 p 3

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA special correspondent I. Yermakov: "The Secret Archipelago"]

[Text] Novaya Zemlya—*After the establishment of the nuclear test range on Novaya Zemlya, entry into the world's largest military base with an area of 32,000 square kilometers was tightly closed to all outsiders, including journalists.*

But now, for the first time in all these years, in response to a request from the editorial staff the Armed Forces General Staff and the Main Staffs of the Air Defense Troops and the Navy gave an "OK" to a Novaya Zemlya visit....

The Situation

Several seconds of semidarkness, then our "An" emerges from the clouds. Below, the leaden grayness of the Bering Sea. The ground appears suddenly. Barely sticking out of the water, it is as level as a table that painted in two colors—brown and green. Tongues of fjords cut deeply into this smooth surface and, together with numerous lakes, make it look like a lace shawl.

While still in flight over the island, I caught a glimpse of the launchers of a missile battery glistening in the sun. A major unit [soyedineniye] of Air Defense Troops is guarding the peace of the archipelago. Its zone of responsibility is the territory of one-fourth of all of West Europe.

It is difficult to call its operational alert duty tranquil. Of course, this is in my journalistic opinion. But Lieutenant Colonel Anatoliy Ivanov, the operations duty officer, did not see anything unusual in the situation on the day of our visit to the large unit's command post. Standing with a pointer at a large multimeter map board covered with numerous marks, he reported succinctly and factually: Two reconnaissance aircraft and one reconnaissance ship are moving along the border in the control zone; 13 satellites look after us from above; and, closer to the Kola Peninsula, exercises are under way to detect Soviet submarines.

An urgent report interrupts our conversation. Quite peaceful, but nonetheless alarming. A soldier at one of the remote "points" has a serious case of nephritis. A helicopter flies out to where he is. Vyacheslav Savchenko, deputy chief of the political department of the large unit, gave assurances that there has been no case yet of something unfortunate happening to someone because of a delay in medical help.

For these locations, this is of significance. Enormous distances (the length of Novaya Zemlya is almost 1,000 km) and a harsh climate (the temperature at times drops to minus 40 degrees, and the wind—the Novaya Zemlya bora—reaches 50 meters per second) are not easy conditions for carrying out work. In today's blizzard, you cannot see anything two steps in front of you. It is easy to get lost without leaving the garrison. And blasts of wind literally knock you off your feet. It has happened that it was necessary to stand alert duty for seven or eight days in a row in the headquarters of the large unit. Aleksandr Lutsenko, chief of staff of the air regiment, explained:

"From December to the middle of March the weather permitted the completion of only one and a half flight operations shifts from the air base. Blizzards packed the interior sections of the aircraft so solidly with snow that it was difficult to get in with a screwdriver. But operational alert duty was not curtailed—they flew from the mainland.

But we are not talking only of celestial problems—but of very terrestrial ones. The recent ukase on excusing students from service has created difficulties that have not existed, very likely, since the time of the war. No more than one-fifth of the compulsory service subunits remain. The personnel situation has also been aggravated by the massive evasion of call-ups for the Soviet Army. Things have reached the point that the color guard post had to be combined with a similar post of a neighboring unit [chast] of the major unit.

Only the professionalization of military service will fundamentally change the situation. This is what everyone here thinks—from the youngest officer to General Mikhail Savich, the commander of the large unit. And he is even ready to perform with his unit in the role of pioneer experimenter.

Perhaps then the everyday problems will stop being eternal? Judge for yourselves: Is it really normal that 250 officers of the large unit cannot bring their families to their place of service for lack of housing. And it is all right if someone has his own corner on the mainland. But if not?

"It does not matter what happens to me," General Savich says without bravado, "to the family, it is a road to homelessness...."

Radiation

One of my first tasks on the trip was to draw an objective picture of the effects of tests on the ecology and life of the people who are in the immediate vicinity of the epicenter of explosions. The widespread version of the appearance of "balding reindeer" and "fish without scales" also threw oil on the fire. And why not? Air, surface, and underwater triggered bursts were conducted here repeatedly from 1957 to 1964. And to this day there are sectors on the territory of Novaya Zemlya with an increased level of radiation—about a milliroentgen per hour. On 2 August 1987, right after an underground blast, radioactive gases permeated the atmosphere. These facts are known from the speeches of leaders of the Main Staff of the Navy. And, naturally, they did not evoke any particular optimism.

But in fact things turned out to be somewhat more complicated. An incident related by Professor V. Chugunov, doctor of technical sciences and, in Novaya Zemlya terminology, a "tester," seemed to me to be very symbolic in this connection.

At one time, during the height of the "cold" war, speaking from a high tribune N. S. Khrushchev threatened the Americans with the detonation of a bomb of such force that every window "there" would be shattered." Soon after, V. Chugunov had occasion to fly on the next official trip by way of the little settlement of Amderma, which is situated 300 km from the test range. Spare glass windows were in readiness alongside each home....

This episode is characteristic also of our current ideas about the effects of nuclear bursts on the environment. There is no argument that radioactive radiation is very dangerous to health. But it remains to be explained—to whom, when, and where?

After surface nuclear bursts, the main part of the radioactive material is hurled into the stratosphere at an altitude of 10-50 km. It remains there for many months, dropping and spreading evenly over the surface of the entire globe.

All of this is fine, you will say, in theory. But what about in practice? At my request Igor Nizovtsev, assistant to the chief of the department of test-range radiation safety, conducted measurements of radioactivity at various points. And I became convinced with my own eyes that the level here does not exceed 10 milliroentgens on open terrain. Half as low as in Moscow!

There were also no cases here of dangerous radioactivity in the products of the wild game trade—birds, reindeer, or fish. And, incidentally, there are quite a few hunters and fishermen among the garrison residents....

Test range workers also related the end of the story of the "balding reindeer." In this regard, it seems that northern deputies made an inquiry, after which scientists arrived to meet with them. And they immediately "took the bull by the horns." You see, they say, we brought you a balding scientist. And they nod at a comrade. And now, you show us a balding reindeer.... As it turned out there was no such reindeer, and even an eyewitness could not be found.

It is noteworthy that many various kinds of legends exist about the Northern Test Range. Some people, for example, are worried about the fate of the native people of Novaya Zemlya, who have almost become guinea pigs for the military. But there has never been any kind of a native population on the islands. The Nenets reindeer breeders began to populate these places back in the 1920's. But in 1954, after the government decision to set up a test range here, they returned to the mainland.

A lot of suspicions also surfaced with respect to servicemen on Novaya Zemlya, who have allegedly been provided with special "clean" products and can therefore view the conduct of nuclear tests with such calm. I dropped by the local stores. There was a wide selection of canned goods on the shelves... from Gomel. A mean joke, of course, but a fact. What is more, the military commissary, which supplies the island, does not provide any privileges for Novaya Zemlya residents that differ from all other Arctic garrisons....

Problems

The residents of Novaya Zemlya have become accustomed to relying on their own strength. Especially since there are frequent situations here when help cannot be expected from anywhere.

The situation was particularly difficult last winter. During a blizzard a fire broke out in the water intake station, which supplied the "capital" of the archipelago—Belushya Guba. It is eight km from the settlement to the station, an hour's walk over a good road. But it took bulldozers three hours to pull the fire engines there. The wheeled vehicles tipped over in the deep snow. They had to be raised upright manually. The station burned down....

There was drinking water in the neighboring garrison. But it was 14 km away, and through snow. Even the road could not be seen from inside the cabin of the vehicles. And officers, feeling their way with their feet, walked in front of each convoy with the valuable liquid.

But what about heating? There was an emergency reserve of water for one day. It was decided to build a new water intake station on the nearest island. It was done quickly. But the water froze in the water pipes. It was necessary immediately to melt the ice in the pipes with boiling water. The hoses for the boiling water were uncoiled immediately. But the seamen were in felt boots. To get soaked through at such temperatures would very likely mean pneumonia.

There were three among those present who were wearing high boots: Admirals V. Gorev and V. Vyskrebentsev and Captain First Rank N. Trotsko. There was no time for hesitation. They grabbed the hoses and went. There was enough heat from the boiling water for only about 20 meters of the water line. One sector was heated, and they went further....

The snowstorm raged over the island for more than a day. But the garrison held out.

Of course, all of this is in the past. And today Admiral Viktor Gorev, the chief of the test range, is troubled with other difficulties. With scrap metal, for example. There is so much of it scattered about—mountains of it. Metal does not last long here. And when it is worn out—onto the scrap pile. And this has been going on for almost 40 years.

"But it does not matter," says Gorev, "I have to serve five years here, and I have planned to eliminate the scrap heap in that period.... Of course, it was not easy. We gathered it from the whole tundra and brought it to the seaport. You cannot bury thousands of tonnes of metal in the ground. But nobody intends to remove it. I am prepared to give it away for nothing. You see, it can be of use to the country...."

Or, here is another matter. By the way, very unusual. After the Nenets people asked to be resettled on the mainland in connection with the establishment of the test range, the local cemetery was left without an owner. But recently Nenets elders asked Gorev: How are the graves of our relatives there? Do they need looking after?... The admiral did not forget the elders' query. He himself went to see, looked around, and outlined plans for improvements, which he monitors himself.... Although the admiral has enough concerns even without this. All of the problems of our society are reflected in a military collective like the sun in a drop of water.

Is this situation normal?

The struggle to "survive" takes away a lot of strength, adding only new gray hair. Not to freeze in the winter, feed the people, find a place where they can spend free time, and reeducate soldiers and sailors who arrive "to serve out" their compulsory service terms—I am confident that there is no other army in the world that has such a list.

People in uniform did not come here for the sake of personal pleasure. "The motherland ordered it" are not simply words, but the very reason that they are here. And their main task is operational training, not the mastery of areas of the country that are difficult to get to. But while the Union Supreme Soviet is pondering whether we need nuclear test ranges and a professional army, thousands of servicemen are paying for the time of dragged out wavering with their own health and family well-being. It is a paradox, but, in the meantime, the Soviet Army is treated like a stepchild by Soviet authority.

Rocket Troops Political Workers Discuss Problems

PM1210100390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Major A. Dolinin report: "Time Introduces Corrections"]

[Text] A rally of ideological workers of the Strategic Rocket Forces has discussed the most acute problems in political and training activity. Colonel General V. Rodin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces Political Directorate, gave an address. Meetings were held between participants in the rally, representatives of the Foreign Ministry, and Central Television and IAN agency journalists.

Col. Gen. G. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, participated in the work of the rally.

Correction to Debate on Coup Speculation

LD2809233190

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Vasiliyev Chairs Debate Over Coup Speculation," published in the 27 September Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on pages 67-69.

Page 68, column two, first complete paragraph, last sentence, make read: .. some grounds, and make people nervous.

[Vasiliyev] That was.... (changing "need to be remembered" to "make people nervous")

Baltic Republics

Rally Scores Baltic Nationalism, Defends Chikin

PM1110104190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by N. Maandi, press attache of the Interregional Council of People's Deputies and Working People's Delegates of Estonia: "They Expressed Solidarity"]

[Text] Moscow—A rally in support of the Russian-speaking population of the Baltic region organized by the United Front of Working People of Russia has taken place by the main entrance to the Gorkiy Park of Culture.

...Muscovites and Balts [pribalty] spoke one after the other—workers, teachers, scientists, people's deputies.... A representative from Latvia leveled a charge at his own "democrats"—overt nationalists with whose blessing and sometimes even direct involvement monuments to defenders of Soviet power are barbarously destroyed and memorials to former fascists and policemen are erected, thousands-strong detachments of fighters are formed, parallel structures to prosecutor's offices are created, unwelcome employees are given the sack, and attempts are made to nationalize buildings and property belonging to Soviet state organs. Representatives from Estonia and Lithuania added to this list facts and examples of discrimination against the Russian-speaking population in their own republics, while Estonian Arnold Sai gave a direct warning that fascism is being manifested increasingly frequently and overtly in Estonia.

The theme of protecting the civil rights of the Russian-speaking population was closely bound up with another—that of defending the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. In point of fact, the rally developed into a protest action against the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet's illegal resolution on this newspaper. The rally participants were holding slogans and banners in support of it: "We will defend SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and V.V. Chikin, its chief editor" and "Hands off SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA!"

"Under the guise of the struggle for pluralism, our homebred democrats are trying to close down SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, the last Russian Communist newspaper. Where is the much-vaunted democratism of these 'pluralists' if they are closing all channels of true information? Shame!" Igor Malyarov, a teacher at Moscow State University, angrily exclaimed. And the rally participants responded with a thousand-throated "Shame!"

An appeal by employees of the "Khimvolokno" Production Association in the city of Mytishchi addressed to the CPSU Central Committee was read out at the rally. It states:

"The so-called people's deputies of Russia verbally proclaim freedom of the press, while in fact they seek to establish their own diktat over the press and victimization for dissidence. These gentlemen, these 'democrats,' wish to lay their hands on SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, the sole press organ of Russia's Communists, because it dares to counter the ever-intensifying attacks on socialist values and states its position openly and honestly: the socialist choice, the rebirth of Russia, the protection of ordinary working people. We constant readers of this newspaper express full unanimity with its position and demand an end to the campaign of badgering and discrediting People's Deputy V.V. Chikin, its Communist chief editor, for his political convictions. The act of removing the chief editor is unlawful. In the event of a change in the newspaper's orientation we demand that our subscription be refunded."

A collection of signatures for that appeal was organized right there at the rally. We also expressed our solidarity with SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

Coverage of Landsbergis Visit to France

Visit Begins 11 Oct

LD1110180490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania 1712 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, arrived in Paris today. He will take part here in a roundtable [word indistinct] of the politicians of the Republican Party. It is expected that the topic of the report will be the path of East Europe during the downfall of empires.

Today Vytautas Landsbergis met the Francois Mitterrand, French President, as well as Francois Leotard, general secretary of the Republican Party and former candidate to the post of the French president. Views were exchanged on Europe's future, Lithuania's place in it, and the possibilities of Lithuania taking part in the Helsinki Two process.

Vytautas Landsbergis told journalists that the position of France, as the host to the discussions, toward the Baltic states was very important in opening the door to Europe.

Meetings with Paris Mayor Jacques Chirac and other politicans are expected. Apart from other problems, possibilities are to be discussed of opening a French cultural center in Vilnius.

Before leaving for France, Vytautas Landsbergis made a speech on the Icelandic radio. He expressed the idea in his speech that small nations of the world should unite in an organization that would not try to dominate or dictate to other nations, but would aim to heal the wounds of the past. I am sure that the hour is approaching when democratic states will establish direct diplomatic links with Lithuania and thus will confirm it as a legal state with a legal government. Many countries are already now joining a queue after the first state that will recognize

Lithuania. I think that I know which country will be the first, Vytautas Landsbergis stated in his speech on the Icelandic radio.

Predicts 'Full Sovereignty'

AU1210073690 Paris AFP in English 0354 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] Paris, Oct 12 (AFP)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis said here on Thursday that he hoped that his country would regain full sovereignty from the Soviet Union within a year.

Mr. Landsbergis, who was received by French President Francois Mitterrand soon after his arrival to participate in a colloquium on post-cold war Europe, emphasized in an interview with AFP that "sovereignty is not a gift which can be given or taken away. "The only thing which can be taken away is the possibility to realize this sovereignty," he said. "No French citizen during World War II had the least doubt that France would continue to exist and that tanks could not deprive it of its sovereignty. "I am also convinced that Kuwait will not be crossed off the membership list of the United Nations, although it cannot exercise its sovereignty at the present time," he said.

Mr. Landsbergis indicated that his country was preparing a new blueprint for upcoming negotiations with Soviet officials, expected to take place in Moscow.

Visit 'Recognition' of Independence

AU1210114590 Paris AFP in English 1121 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] Paris, Oct 12 (AFP)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis said Friday, after meetings with the French president and prime minister, that he considered his reception here as a "de facto" recognition of Lithuanian independence.

Asked by reporters after an hour-long meeting with Prime Minister Michel Rocard whether the discussion, and talks on Thursday at the Elysee palace with President Francois Mitterrand constituted a de facto recognition, he replied: "I wouldn't want to negate this statement".

Mr. Rocard's aides said however that they saw "no particular significance" in the Rocard-Landsbergis talks, which according to the Lithuanian president focused on "possible ways to regain real independence by Lithuania".

Mr. Rocard told Mr. Landsbergis that he was favourable to an official Lithuanian representation being opened in Paris, Mr. Landsbergis said. At present, Lithuania has a "personal" representative here.

Minutes before Mr. Landsbergis arrived, a red carpet was hastily rolled up and a 10-man honour guard dismissed. Rocard aides said afterwards that such a welcome would have been that for a visiting prime minister, adding that Mr. Landsbergis "is making a private visit" to France "and Lithuania is not an independent state".

The Lithuanian official was also to be received later Friday by French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, and parliamentary speaker Laurent Fabius.

Mr. Landsbergis, who arrived here Thursday to attend a symposium on the collapse of communism in eastern Europe, said he discussed possible cooperation with France in developing "cultural, political and information fields".

French officials said that possible cooperation in telecommunications was discussed Friday.

Concerning negotiations with Moscow on Lithuanian independence, Mr. Landsbergis expressed satisfaction with progress, and noted that further consultations between Vilnius and the Kremlin were scheduled for next week.

On Thursday, he said that he hoped Lithuania, annexed by Moscow in 1940, would recover its sovereignty "in the next year".

It is the Lithuanian president's first visit to western Europe. He arrived here after a Scandinavian tour. In Oslo, he opened a Lithuanian information bureau.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Continues Work 11 Oct

LD1210044590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] The second session of the Supreme Council continued its work today.

Having approved the agenda, the deputies at a closed meeting confirmed Deputy Jonas Simenas as the chairman of the Permanent Nature Protection Commission.

The session adopted a law on diplomatic ranks of the Republic of Lithuania. A draft of amendments and supplements to the law on the improvement of pensions of Lithuania's residents was submitted.

A draft law of the Republican economic communities was examined. It was decided to adopt this law at the next meeting.

Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene submitted to parliament a program of economic reform, one of the composite parts of the government program.

Economics Minister Vytautas Navickas acquainted the deputies with the conclusions of the public discussion on economic reform. A reply on this issue on behalf of the government was made by Deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas.

At the end of the session, Deputy Zenonas Juknevicius acquainted parliament with the conclusions of the

Supreme Council commission on the violation of the order of taking away material wealth from Lithuania.

Prunskiene Advocates Privatization 'Without Delay'

LD1110211190 Moscow TASS in English 2051 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius October 11 TASS—Privatisation of state property should begin without delay, Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene said.

Today she delivered in Lithuanian Parliament a report presenting the government programme of the Lithuanian Republic's economic reform.

The Lithuanian prime minister said that it is the main thing now to find owner to state property. [sentence as received] She said that privatisation is one of the most important aspects of Lithuania's economic reform.

The government recognises the right of every person to the property he or she owned prior to 1940. She noted however that at present there is no real opportunity to compensate every person for what he was deprived of. Therefore the cabinet proposed to carry out privatisation through investment cheques bearing the owner's name.

The prime minister explained that this financial document will be issued to every Lithuanian citizen and offer the right to purchase privatised state property to a sum indicated in the cheque-books. These cheques are not for sale and can only be inherited.

Prunskiene said that attraction of foreign investments is an important part of the programme of economic reforms. She said that Lithuania will try to come in possession of ports as soon as possible, to create its own system of communications with other countries, to receive the right to issue visas, open air routes and other transport ways and assume control of borders and communications.

Prunskiene said that the Lithuanian Government will submit the draft law on privatisation to parliament next week.

Lithuanian-USSR Working Group Meets in Moscow

LD1110104390 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budrys]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—A meeting of the joint working group to prepare official talks between the delegations of the Soviet Union and Lithuanian began here today.

The group, headed by Deputy Prime Ministers of the Soviet Union and Lithuania, vitaliy Doguzhiyev and Romualdas Ozolas, was set up at the October 2 consultative meeting of the two official delegations.

The group was asked to prepare, within two weeks, specific proposals on the problems and procedural matters of the forthcoming talks and to submit them to the delegations for discussion at their next meeting.

"We arrived here to suggest ways to normalise relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union," Ozolas told TASS on Wednesday.

The Soviet and Lithuanian sections of the group had no telephone consultations since October 2, he said. Therefore this meeting will be of deliberative nature. At the same time, according to Ozolas, the Lithuanian official delegation and the working group did a large amount of preparatory work.

The group brought a number of proposals to Moscow, specifically a time-table for future meetings that will be offered for consideration to the section headed by Doguzhiyev, Ozolas said.

"If they are found to be unacceptable to the Soviet side, we shall suggest a standby version that we have worked out," he said.

Without disclosing the specific contents of the Lithuanian side's proposals, Ozolas described them as "productive."

Ozolas Discusses Talks

LD1110173490 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budrys]

[Text] Moscow October 11 TASS—The current meeting between representatives of the Soviet Union and Lithuania is marked by "a mutual desire to seek a compromise", Lithuanian Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas told TASS today.

He made this remark after a working group meeting here today to prepare official talks between Vilnius and Moscow. According to Ozolas, at the meeting the sides made their proposals, which "largely coincided".

As was reported, the joint working group, led by Ozolas and Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiev, was set up on October 2 at a consultation meeting of Soviet and Lithuanian official delegations.

Members of the group held a four-hour meeting discussing procedural matters and the subject of future talks and agreed to set up ten special commissions, each to deal with a specific group of problems.

One such commission will start working in Moscow on October 15 to draft a protocol. The protocol will be discussed at the next meeting of official delegations.

Lithuania Acknowledges Pre-1940 Ownership Rights

LD1210134690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 12 Oct 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Lithuanian Government has acknowledged the right of former owners to have the property they owned up to 1940 returned to them. True, Lithuania has no feasible way of being able to settle accounts with those who suffered expropriation.

Lithuanian Communists Support Independence

LD1110235890 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Yesterday the Plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee made a statement on the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Stressing that the party backs up independence, the statement points out a number of internal and external factors complicating Lithuania's progress towards that goal, namely: the Soviet Union is unwilling to lose territories it once ruled, the West is reluctant to recognize Lithuania's independence before the Kremlin does so, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is engaged in destructive activity, the flow of foreign capital to Lithuania is insignificant due to the political instability of the country.

Among the internal negative factors are: the worsening economic situation, an [word indistinct] legal system [words indistinct] in society.

The Lithuanian Communists speak up for talks with the Soviet Union; our own Constitution clearly dividing the functions of legislative, executive, and juridical bodies of power; and for privatization as the basis of an economic reform.

Lithuanian Information Center Opens in Oslo

LD0810052590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 7 Oct 90

[Summary] S. Adomavicius, assistant to V. Landsbergis, said in a phone call from Oslo, Norway, that the official opening of the Lithuanian Information Bureau, which is the first Lithuanian Information Bureau in Europe, took place at 1200 local time in Oslo.

Taking part in the opening were V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council; Knut Vollebaek, Norwegian state secretary for foreign affairs; Ingvald Godal, member of the Norwegian parliament and chairman of the parliamentary Baltic Group; Leonas Godas, head of the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Norway; Johan Tang, chairman of the Lithuanian and Norwegian Association; Dag Anderssen, representative of the Lithuanian-Norwegian Corporation; and Reidar Osgard, chairman of the Association of Nordic Countries.

Speaking on behalf of the Government of Norway and the minister of foreign affairs, Knut Vollebaek greeted everyone on the occasion of the opening of the Lithuanian Information Bureau in Oslo. He said he hoped that the opening of the bureau would stimulate further cooperation between Lithuania and Norway. He said that it was a great pleasure to point out that the first Lithuanian Information Bureau in Europe was opened in Norway. He also said that the Information Agency of the three Baltic states would be opened in Copenhagen in November of this year.

Ingvald Godal, Norwegian MP and head of the parliamentary Baltic Group, said that he was sure that this information center would soon expand into a diplomatic embassy, into a consulate. He said that Norway would make efforts so that Lithuania and other Baltic states would soon become completely independent states.

Latvian Majority Said Acting 'Imprudently'

PM1210090190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by correspondent O. Meshkov: "Will the Winter Be Hot? Latvia: What Is Happening in the Republic"]

[Text] Riga—There was a time when it was easy to gain an idea of the situation in the republic by spending a day or two here. Now, when we hear news from the Ukraine about the flood of rallies and about overt victimization of and moral terror against Communists, we say: "We have already been through this."

Indeed there are hardly any rallies, strikes, or demonstrations in Latvian cities now. But there were. All that has happened—to excess. During the mass demonstrations the People's Front tried to stir up the inhabitants' emotions, to fire them with the idea of national awakening, and to attract as many supporters as possible to its camp. Understandably so since elections to the organs of power were looming. A wave of rallies and demonstrations organized by the International Front rose up in response. All this happened.... And somehow, almost at once, it abated and vanished after the overwhelming majority of seats in the republican parliament went to People's Front members, and the same situation took shape in many rayon and city soviets. The struggle and the confrontation moved onto a different plane—the People's Front now uses purely parliamentary methods in its endeavors to consistently resolve tasks as they emerge.

The Latvian Communist Party and the International Front of Working People of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic suffered a manifest major defeat in the election. However, it was somewhat heartening that soon afterward there was a change—in the direction of mutual understanding and cooperation—in the attitude of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee toward the International Front in whose ranks, according to its leader I. Lopatin, there are now some 600,000 members. Add to this alliance an organization with direct links to production like the United Council of Labor Collectives, and it is not hard to imagine that the coordinated actions of these and certain other organizations constitute a very major force. It was at just this time that the "Equal Rights" faction was created in parliament. It consistently and persistently champions the line of the parliamentary minority, i.e. the opposition. True, when it suits them the People's Front deputies do not take very much account of it, and voting cards are held up "for" and "against" in a disciplined manner as a conventional sign—in short, the voting machinery operates with precision.

Thus a non-coalition government was created consisting entirely of People's Front supporters. Laws and resolutions are adopted in the Supreme Soviet, some of which run counter to the USSR Constitution. Next in line is the discussion and adoption of what are probably the most important, and if I may put it like this, dangerously explosive laws: the law on citizenship and the law on parties and public organizations.

I believe that the majority factions are acting imprudently in advancing drafts of these laws unacceptable to the overwhelming majority of the nonindigenous population. The statement by well-known Lettish writer A. Bels was too self-assured: We will not drive anyone out of Latvia, but we will adopt laws which will ensure the outcome. It seems to me that the reader understands on what plane the struggle is now being waged in the republic between opposing forces. In speaking of imprudence and excessive self-assurance, what I mean above all is that there are hardly grounds for expecting submissiveness or meekness in the face of an inevitable outcome. No one can say with total certainty how events will develop. Very many factors could influence their future course. It seems to me that hasty lawmaking without regard for the interests of all sections and groups of the population, including the nonindigenous population, and simple discrimination against the latter will tend now to rally that section which makes up almost 50 percent, no less, of the republic's population.

It is not hard to imagine the mood in which, after the adoption of discriminatory laws, this virtual half of the republic's population would participate in a referendum to decide the question of which path Latvia's future development is to take—as part of or outside the USSR—as well as the question of the form of statehood. And we learned from a report on M.S. Gorbachev's recent 90-minute meeting with Latvia's leadership that the country's president also insists on just such an expression of the will of the republic's entire—precisely entire!—population. So the parliamentarians should also take account of this option for the development of events.

Maybe the parliamentarians, namely the majority faction, are gambling not only on adopting laws which in themselves ensure such a desired outcome but also on achieving economic independence from all the other republics and from the center in the very near future? Because even a child understands that only someone who can support himself can be truly independent. Alas, here is the opinion of the Latvian economist E. Amerik: "The republic's economy today may be compared with a sick person who was still walking recently, albeit with difficulty, but has now taken to his bed altogether." And statistics bear this out. The total volume of industrial production during January-August fell by 54.6 million rubles, or 0.9 percent, compared with the same period last year. In August the decline was more substantial—2.8 percent. Production has fallen in varying degrees at 180 associations and enterprises. This is almost 60 percent of the total number. Here are the opinions of practical economic planners.

V. Tokarev, general director of the "Sarkanays Kvadrats" Production Association: "Never has there been such low contract discipline and such muddle over deliveries, above all in the republic's economic organism."

V. Belyayev, director of the "Ellar" Plant: "It is hard to live in a state of suspension when you do not know what will happen next. The center adopts one decision, Russia another, and Latvia yet another. But the plant depends on everyone and must produce output."

You increasingly frequently encounter violations of economic ties which had evolved over years. And it is quite unforgivable when ties between enterprises inside the republic are violated, sometimes simply out of selfishness. Unfortunately such examples are not isolated. Barter is becoming increasingly widespread and having a tangible impact. And those who have nothing to offer but money—and there are quite a few such people—are left empty-handed.

And finally, here is the assessment which I. Godmanis, chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, made of the present state of affairs at its recent session: "We are on a steady downward slide, with inflation rising to approximately 15 percent a year."

It cannot be said that the republic's government and Supreme Soviet are inactive. No, extensive work is being done and laws and resolutions are being adopted. For example, the long-awaited law on entrepreneurial activity has just been adopted. If it can be introduced into practice quickly and efficiently, it will be possible to resolve a very great problem with considerably more success, namely it will be possible to equalize the operating conditions of state enterprises and cooperatives.

But of course success in this matter depends entirely and totally on how efficient the executive power proves to be. But can it be efficient, given the legal nihilism which has gripped various levels of administration in the republic? Unfortunately, there are many examples of this. Thus a session of Riga City Soviet adopted a resolution ending sales of apartments, which goes manifestly against the financial stabilization measures being taken in Latvia.

How can the leadership of the republic Council of Ministers and members of the Supreme Soviet now complain about legal nihilism if they themselves are essentially acting in the same way? Here, for example, is quite a recent instance: Contrary to the existing law, they took it on themselves at a session of the republic parliament to disqualify the republic Prosecutor's Office and appoint their own general prosecutor of Latvia. But the USSR general prosecutor said in turn that the decision had no legal force.

I recently attended the traditional annual festival of the bulletin YEDINSTVO, the press organ of the republic's International Front. I recall the address to the gathering by USSR People's Deputy V. Alksnis who is always noted for his keen view of various problems and processes. "I do not wish to be a prophet, but in my opinion a hungry, cold, and at the same time hot winter awaits us," Viktor Imantovich said. Hot, the deputy explained, because the conditions of existence which have become harder, and the inevitable redundancies at unprofitable enterprises and collective farms which are closing down, could push workers and peasants toward serious public actions. I totally agree with V. Alksnis on this. And so there is no way I can understand the following: Why, on the threshold of all these difficulties and unpleasantnesses, is the republic's parliament still preparing to adopt a law which will, in point of fact, outlaw the Latvian Communist Party? Are our parliamentarians seriously reckoning on the Communists' sheeplike submission? Do they really not foresee the possible consequences? Or is someone in very great need of a hot winter and hot events? In that case all this resembles the game of "warm, warmer, hot," where "hot" is precisely the required goal. But we are not playing a children's game....

Latvia Appoints Charge d'Affaires to Estonia

LD1110133190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Text] Aldis Berezins, a professionally educated diplomat, who until now worked as a leading specialist at the Estonian Ministry of Education, has been appointed a provisional charge d'affaires of the Republic of Latvia to the Republic of Estonia.

In connection with transfer to other work, Nikolajs Neilands has been released as deputy minister of foreign affairs of Latvia.

Janis Kalejs has been released from duties as deputy minister of people's education in connection with the ministry's reorganization.

Estonian Food Price Increases Expected 15 Oct

LD1210124290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1200 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] It has been announced in Tallinn today that from Monday [15 October] prices of food products are to increase in Estonia: meat and meat products by 2.4 times, milk and milk products by 2.7 times. The price of bread, macaroni, flour, and groats will double. Experts estimate that the standard of living will decline by some 15 to 20 percent.

Estonia To Contribute Anew to Union Budget

PM1110141590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Oct 90 p 2

[Report by unidentified correspondent: "Realism Has Prevailed"]

[Text] Tallinn, 10 Oct—Estonia will again contribute its share to the all-Union budget.

This decision has been adopted by the republic Supreme Soviet, abrogating the resolution which has been in operation since the end of last year. It was economic realities which forced the parliamentarians to take this step mooted by certain radicals. Estonia is connected to the USSR by myriad links. The unilateral rupturing of those links produced chaos in the provision of resources for the republic's national economy and hampered commodity exchange.

Estonian Legislature Discusses Taxes, Economy

LD1110155390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 11 Oct 90

[From the "Television News Service " program]

[Text] In Tallinn, the republic's Supreme Soviet session is coming to an end. Our correspondent V. Velman reports:

The session started with an unprecedented demarche by the Estonian Government which addressed a proposal to the deputies to remove from the agenda the discussion of the entire package of draft laws on taxes. It was then explained that the Supreme Soviet is allegedly delaying the adoption of these fundamental documents, thereby hindering the ultimate settling of the republican budget. This is why the government came into conflict with the legislators, having decided to put into effect a taxation policy by their own decisions, thereby getting the market mechanism to operate.

Yet another problem is worrying Estonia today—the draft law on the economic frontier which has called forth acute hostility both on the part of the Interbloc as well as on the part of the national radicals. The Narva State Council has even adopted a decision to introduce a state of emergency on its territory in the event of this law being approved, and has addressed the relevant appeal to the residents of the northeastern part of the republic. Yesterday, a group of Estonian ministers left for Narva to review the situation.

[Begin recording R. Vare, minister of state of Estonia] In the sphere of the economy we can very often come up against certain speculation which is interterritorial, that is speculation that is not located on the territory of the republic but that is spread, or as it were is taking place on account of the difference in the purchasing possibilities, demands, and buying up prices and so forth between individual areas—for example between Estonia and other regions or the other way round. It is just the same. Today it is probably understandable to everyone that this has to be combatted: The economic frontier is aimed at this. [end recording]

Estonia Issues Public Holidays Decree

LD1110170590 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Albert Maloveiyan]

[Text] Tallinn October 11 TASS—The Presidium of the Estonian Supreme Soviet has issued a decree establishing that Independence Day, Victory Day and May Day should be observed as public holidays on February 24, June 23 and May 1 respectively.

The first two holidays date from the period between 1918-1940. Revival Day is to be observed on November 16, marking the Estonian Supreme Soviet's declaration on sovereignty in 1988, which proclaimed the supremacy of Estonian laws over Soviet ones on its territory.

Christmas, New Year and the St. Johns Day will also be observed as public holidays.

The day of the Great October Socialist Revolution, observed on November 7 across the Soviet Union, and Victory Day on May 9 were dropped from Estonia's new calendar.

Estonia-Leningrad Oblast Plan Economic Region

LD1110220290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] A joint session of the soviets of people's deputies of the Estonian towns of Kohhtla-Jarve, Sillamae, and Narva, and the Russian towns of Kingisepp, Slantsy, and Ivangorod took place today in Narva which is situated on the symbolic border between Estonia and Leningrad Oblast. They adopted a decision to start setting up, through common efforts, a united economic and self-governing region in which the protection of the interests of all the population resident there will be guaranteed, regardless of their ethnic, social, or political allegiance.

In a declaration they adopted, the participants in the joint session stated that it was impermissible for Estonia and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic to sign an interstate agreement without taking into account the opinions and interests of all the population of the border territories.

The demand that the law on the economic frontier be withdrawn from discussion in the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Republic was also put forward at the session.

Estonian Document Details Leaseholders' Rights

LD1210043790 Moscow TASS in English 2146 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] Tallinn October 12 ETA-TASS—The law on leaseholding published in Estonia on Thursday regulates leaseholding and sets out the principles for the implementation of leaseholders' rights and performance of duties.

The document says that leaseholding can be applied in all areas where it is not prohibited by laws of the Estonian republic. Any property can be leassed. A leasing contract is concluded for a certain term or indefinitely. It can also be concluded by auctions. A citizen or legal person can be a lease holder.

The law stipulates the amount of lease and the procedure of the transfer of leaseholding. A full or partial buying out of property and the procedure for the resumption of the lease are envisaged.

The document says that the leaseholder decides on his activities and on the use of products and incomes and is independent in the performance of work and rendering of services.

Disputes during the conclusion of a contract are taken to an arbitration tribunal. The rights of the leaseholder on the leased property are ensured on the same grounds as the protection of the proprietor's rights.

If the property of an enterprise is leased, employers of the enterprise have advantage for the conclusion of a leasing contract. The republic's government has been instructed to stipulate the procedure and terms for setting up a lease enterprise as well as the principles of a lease contract by November 1. The enumeration of property which is not to lease is to be endorsed by the same deadline. Terms on which the leased property can be bought out will also be stipulated. The law on lease does not apply to housing.

RSFSR

Supreme Soviet Appoints New Government Members

LD1110220690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 11 October broadcasts an 87-minute report on proceedings at the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet committees and commissions on 11 October. The program begins by focusing on the meeting between Boris Oleynik, deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Democratic Union, Memorial, and other parties and groups.

Oleynik is then interviewed, and he notes that he hails from the Ukraine. He says that the representatives of the parties which he has just met give the impression of representing young parties, noting that "some of them look somewhat ironically on reality." Oleynik adds that there is a style among them which is somewhat reminiscent of a political rally.

The report then shifts to the USSR committee on cultural heritage which has been discussing the law on outrages to monuments. An academician cited the case of a monument to Andrey Rublev, the icon painter, being defaced. An unidentified deputy says that the fight against vandalism is a fight against symptoms when the means of fighting against the causes are already exhausted.

Polikarpova then says that the price committee has been discussing price formation under a market economy. Zhuravlev, in an interview says that a law on price formation should originate these days from below since all the republics are declaring their sovereignty. The Union should only set prices on those areas which are delegated to it, i.e. raw materials. We should not be frightened of a price hike. But it is important that wages keep pace with price rises. Therefore, price formation must not be divorced from wage policy and the money supply. Prices and wages must increase. This is inevitable. "Prices, money, and wages must be examined in one lump."

Zhuravlev says that he is not an evil person. But people who are hoodwinking the people with regard to apprehension about a market economy should be responsibe before the law.

The report then notes that the USSR committee on architecture and construction has been discussing investment legislation in the context of a market economy. Podberezskiy (not further unidentified) says that investment must be aimed at cutting down the number of unfinished construction projects. Mchalalobliskiy (not further unidentified) agrees with this, saying that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is the "godfather" of the law on investment which is to be introduced. The two deputies agree that this law is very necessary. Investment in housing construction must be transferred to the countryside. If the law on investment is correctly applied it will facilitate the building of more beautiful buildings. It is not a panacea, but architects will be able to build more beautiful buildings.

The report then switches to the RSFSR Suprme Soviet, noting that Prime Minister Silayev has put forward six new candidate members of his government. The video shows Valeriy Petrovich Chernogorodskiy, prospectice chairman of the state committee for anti-monopoly policy. A deputy speaks in favor of his candidature. He talks about his "profound knowledge." He has received great help from Chernogorodskiy.

Another unidentified deputy speaks in support of Chernogorodskiy. Chernogorodskiy has been active in the "serious" anti-monopoly legislature which has been implemented.

Votes for Chernogorodskiy are taken: 149 in favor; 26 against; 13 abstentions.

Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, candidate RSFSR foreign minister, then speaks: "Allow me to set out some of my preliminary views on what this [Russian foreign policy] concept could be like. First of all, I want to express my conviction that a law-governed democratic Russian state, as part of a renewed Union, as the declaration says, is not a curiosity and not the sick man of Europe and the world. In our republic there is regrettably a lot of poverty. We are starting many things practically from square one and that includes foreign policy. But let us not forget that we are restoring a statehood which has a history and a culture that span many centuries. An underestimation of this at home or abroad would be a political miscalculation. That is something I want to say irrespective of who is going to be minister of foreign affairs.

"It goes without saying that the point of departure for Russian foreign policy is the new thinking. For Russia this is a policy of common sense, realism in assessing oneself and others. It means concern for the survival not only of the whole world but also of Russia, not globalist-imperial interests but normal geopolitical and economic interests. These interests could be schematically divided into three natural spheres, two of which seem to me to be vital. The first sphere is our neighbors in the northern hemisphere: Europe, Asia, and of course North America. It is precisely among these countries that Russia must take its rightful place, and it must join their ranks above all according to indicators such as the standard of living and the quality of life of the population. Last, the third sphere [as heard] is all remaining countries, with which we also naturally need to have normal, cultured, and economically mutually advantageous relations.

"Several words about priorities. The first is to assist the 500 days program by providing an international credit of trust for it—although I must say that such a credit is taking shape rapidly, as far as I can judge from available information—and to bring external support to bear on the economic measures of the government. This incidentally is no retreat from a global stance. Russia is fated to be a great power, but the point at issue is that the majority of the states in the world are today switching the focus of their policy to economic indicators from traditional military ones and ones based on force. Another priority is indicated in the decision of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies on minimizing the consequences of Chernobyl. We have to consolidate the existing groundwork at the present session of the General Assembly now under way in New York, and in future we need to develop practical work. Something is already being done on this. One of the most important concerns of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a whole is of course ecology. The third priority is the elimination of high-cost mechanisms. Above all, the Supreme Soviet has to consider in a most serious manner the military budget, or at any rate Russia's contribution to it in terms of reducing it. In exactly the same way, it is necessary to look into our foreign obligations as far as aid and military supplies are concerned. In my view, the lessons of the crisis in the Persian Gulf insistently point us in that direction. I should like to say in parenthesis that Russia needs a strong and up-to-date army, but not the ideological ambitions of a global superpower with the spending that entails. It is more important to channel resources into creating human conditions for Russian soldiers and officers and Afghan veterans; to render aid, given that we are rendering aid, to the small peoples and disaster areas in Russia itself; and to carry out an economically tenable conversion [of the military industry]. The fourth priority is local contacts, contacts in all spheres with adjacent states above all, and also public and human contacts, links with Russians abroad, the restoration of the rights of compatriots, support for cultural and religious movements—including state support in maintaining the property of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad—and also of course that of other denominations. Foreign policy activity must in general above all ease the everyday life of Russians and help them to have free and safe contacts with the world.

"On the subject of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, this should be a small but able-bodied and well-equipped apparatus. As far as the affiliation of members of the apparat to this or that party is concerned, then this is their personal business outside working hours. I consider that this also holds for ministers, insofar as it is a question of the representation of national state interests.

"There is, it goes without saying, one more sphere of cooperation with the Union republics. Here the foundation should be primarily the principles of international law and human rights, especially, from our point of view, protection of the rights of Russians. Finally I would like to count, if you confirm me, on the fact that cooperation with the Supreme Soviet and its committees will continue, I hope without conflicts, insofar as this is a key aspect to ensure that foreign policy functions normally.

"I must say that in democratic countries the foreign minister spends up to 50 percent of his time in internal diplomacy, if you will his parliaments and parliamentarians. I think that this is a completely correct principle. Finally, I would advocate people's deputies' and public representatives' direct participation in the resolution of international affairs. Thank you, Ruslan Imranovich.

"[Khasbulatov] Questions to Andrey Vladimirovich, please.

"[Volkogonov] Esteemed Andrey Vladimirovich! I have this question. Perhaps I have not understood very well, but I would like to amplify something. On the whole your program gives rise to sympathy and respect for its competence, but it seemed to me that you said that Russia must have a strong army? You talked about the army. If this is so, then I do not understand at all whether the Union should have a strong army, or do you consider that both the Union should have a strong army and Russia should have a strong army? If Russia should have a strong army then it implies that there will no longer be a Union army. I would like you to amplify your view on this question. And en pasant, a small question. What is your view on the problem of the so-called northern territories? Very briefly, two words.

"[Kozyrev] Thank you. First of all, I must say that the problem of the competence of the Union and Russian bodies is not so much a problem of executive power as a question which should be resolved by you—that is people's deputies—since you will decide.

"Up until today as you know—better than me, it goes without saying—the functions of distribution are such that the question of defense has been transfered to the Union. Therefore, I was talking about how I see Russia's interests proceeding from this fact. It goes without saying that the question of defense is within the competence of the Union. I think the Union, and this completely corresponds to Russian interests, needs a strong modern army, but as I have already said not an army which corresponds to the Criteria of various ideological and globalistic ambitions which today belong to the past. This is what I meant.

"[Volkogonov] The northern territories?

"[Kozyrev] Now as far as the northern territories are concerned, I am afraid that it is difficult to answer this question briefly since you have in fact set the conditions that the answer should be brief. It seems to me that now approaches are being sought toward this issue. I would be in favor of the appropriate committees and commissions of the Russian Supreme Soviet studying this problem extremely seriously in the very near future—with the aid of the Foreign Ministry, it goes without saying—and defining their position here. I would make the cornerstone the interests of the economic renaissance of Russia.

"[Khasbulatov] Fourth.

"[Mashko] Dat Mashko, Sverdlovsk oblast. Esteemed Andrey Vladimirovich! There are some things which indeed also put me on my guard. Therefore I would like to know whether, in the post of foreign minister, you will follow the directives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and how do you intend to build your mutual relations with the multiparty Russian Supreme Soviet? Thank you.

"[Kozyrev] I have already attempted to expound on this thought. It seems to me that party groupings or groups are a quite natural thing within a corpus of deputies. At the same time, such departments as a Foreign Ministry should pursue state policy as it is determined in its concept and ratified by the Supreme Soviet. As far as party affiliation is concerned, beginning with the minister and ending with all the other workers, it seems to me that in this department it is the personal business of each person outside working hours.

"[Khasbulatov] Comrade deputies, I will put it to the vote. Who is for Comrade Kozyrev, Andrey Vladimirovich, being appointed foreign minister of the Russian Federation? Please cast your vote."

Video shows the vote count is 149 for; 26 against; with 13 abstentions.

Khasbualtov continues: "Adopted. Congratulations to Kozyrev, Andrey Vladimirovich, on his appointment to this lofty and important post which will do much, I think, to help determine foreign policy—not only foreign, we have complex relations with the republics, with the Union republics, and here there must be the active policy of our foreign minister. I congratulate you once more."

Yevgeniy Borisovich Komarov, candidate chairman for the socioeconomic development of the north, is the next speaker. He is given 10 minutes. He talks about bringing order to deer hunting. Proper clothing for people working in the tundra is required. Social policy is needed for the acquisition of the resources of the north. The first question comes from Yevtushenko. He asks why his electorate does not get a bonus for living in the north. Komarov replies that the question of definition of a region of the far north must be put to the Supreme Soviet. The fact that people living in the same house can get a bonus while others cannot is a disgrace.

An unidentified deputy says that according to his biography Komarov has been involved throughout his life in party work. Why has he switched from party to government executive work? Komarov admits that he was a party worker, but has since left that work.

A woman who claims to be a member of a small nation of the north calls on deputies to support Komarov.

She asks for the deputies to forget the political nuances.

Votes for Komarov are taken: 127 for, 53 against, 17 abstentions. Komarov is adopted.

Khasbulatov then says that Yeltsin will attend a sitting of the constitutional committee 12 October. The Tuvan Republic gets a round of applause for its anniversary.

Boris Aleksandrovich Furmanov, candidate for the post of chairman of the state committee for architecture and construction, is given 10 minutes to speak. He says that the committee must take over from the union the setting of norms for construction in the RSFSR. All the research institutes on the territory must be subjected to its control. Under its auspices, the restoration of national monuments and the renaissance of the north will be undertaken. Measures must be undertaken to stabilize the situation in the construction industry.

An unidentified deputy says that Khrushchev's buildings are being pulled down. What does Furmanov have to say about this? Furmanov replies that a careful attitude must be taken to what already exists and what should be restored. A group of specialists will look at how to develop town planning.

A Daghestan deputy asks for his opinion on Armenian construction. Furmanov notes he was three months in Armenia last year. He praises the construction industry in Armenia. From 1991 the transfer of material resources could be limited and Armenia could be asked to help in Russian construction. This is his personal opinion.

On the question of uncompleted construction projects, Furmanov says that three or four years are needed to complete every project that has been started in the RSFSR. However, the volume of uncompleted construction is stabilizing

Zinoviyev, a member of the invalids subcommittee, asks what help will Furmanov give with regard to the integration of handicapped people in the sphere of housing.

Furmanov envisages incentives for making buildings invalid-friendly. On a personal note, his father has been in a wheelchair for the past five-years, and for this reason he perfectly understands the problems of invalids.

Votes for Furmanov are taken: 162 for; 17 against; 16 abstentions.

Semen Semenovich Voloshchuk, candidate for the post of chairman for the committee on the elimination of the aftermath of Chernobyl, then takes the floor. More than 1,000 population points in the RSFSR has been affected by the tragedy. Unjustified delay in organizational work has been allowed in clearing up the aftermath. The inhabitants of the area are rightly outraged.

A member of the ecological committee says that Chernobyl is not the only ecological disaster. Should a suitable committee be set up for each one, or should there be a blanket committee?

The committee he is hoping to lead is only to deal with Chernobyl. However, there should be differentiated benefits for all those living in polluted zones and not just Chernobyl.

Voting for Voloshchuk is 147 in favor; 26 against; 12 abstentions.

Semen Semenovich Ivchenkov, candidate for RSFSR social provision minister, is then rejected by 98 votes for, 80 votes against, and 19 abstentions.

The work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will continue in committees and commissions on 12 October, it is noted.

Chernogorodskiy Interviewd

LD1110215590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Interview with Valeriy Chernogorodskiy, newly-elected Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic chairman of the State Committee for Anti-Monopoly Policy and Support to New Economic Structures, by correspondent Korotkov, in Moscow on October—recorded]

[Text] [Chernogorodskiy] Private enterprises, joint-stock enterprises, small and leasehold enterprises will be set up and they are naturally coming into conflict with the big monopolist enterprises. The committee's function is, on the one hand, to cut short abuses by the big structures of their monopoly position and to support the emerging new economic structures, irrespective of the form of ownership.

[Korotkov] Forgive me for being naive, but perhaps it is not worth creating for such purposes an entire committee with probably a sizeable staff?

[Chernogorodskiy] No, the committee will have a staff of 150. If you compare this with countries which already have a market economy, in the United States for instance, the small business support administration alone has 4,000 people. So 150 is not many at all for carrying out such a complex program, especially during the transition period.

[Korotkov] We have never had such a committee in our country and this kind of work has virtually never been done. What will you be guided by in your activities, what experience?

[Chernogorodskiy] We are structuring our work and the committee's working concept on the basis of world experience and also of an analysis of the real concrete economic situation now obtaining in our country. This is without question unlike anything else, past or present—the situation we are in is unique. The committee has drawn up a draft law on the development of competition, support for competition, and thwarting monopolist activities, and we are also actively at work now, together with the Committee on Economic Reform and Ownership, preparing a unified law on enterprises and enterprise. We shall also interact, and already are interacting with various public organizations, the Union of Leaseholders, the Union of Cooperative Workers, the Peasants' Union, the Union of Managers, the Union of Small Enterprises and so on. And also with the mass media and local authorities.

[Korotkov] So to sum up, your task is not to set up any big concerns but to bolster small private, privatized enterprises?

[Chernogorodskiy] Well we are not going to set up anything at all. We shall create the conditions for such enterprises to thrive, with due consideration for attracting foreign capital to set up such enterprises so that even foreign investors can set up enterprises entirely by themselves.

Yeltsin Resumes Work Following Car Accident

LD1210092190 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin today resumed his work after a three-week interval caused by injuries sustained in a car crash on September 21.

Yeltsin stayed at home throughout the interval on doctors' instructions.

Today, Yeltsin opened a plenary meeting of the Russian Constitutional Commission, which he chairs. The commission is to discuss a draft new constitution of the Russian Federation.

Silayev Discusses Delay in Economic Program

PM1110152490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p4

[Unattributed interview with Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Premier I. Silayev]

[Text] [MOSCOW NEWS] Having postponed the start of reforms, the government and parliament of Russia have caused a lot of pessimism. Is it because the republic is unprepared for radical reform? Or is it a capitulation to the Centre's tough policy which did not wish to approve either the Shatalin programme or the agreed "presidential" version?

[Silayev] There's nothing sensational about our decision to postpone the start of the reform. We've always believed that a radical market economy reform must be conducted on a nationwide scale. The government of the Russian Federation, and the Supreme Soviet, have consistently favoured a renewed federation, an all-Union market, hence all its components—a single national currency, a coordinated credit and financial policy, common customs rules.... Therefore, from the very beginning we intended to start the reforms simultaneously with all the republics, with the Union as a whole. Unfortunately, the USSR Supreme Soviet has failed to make its choice, delaying its final decision unitl October 15. The Union republics, too, did not have enough time to work out their ideas for the programme. In this situation we think it reasonable to display self-control and wait for the Union and republics' decisions.

We believe that the President, the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and of the republics, will ultimtely make a choice either favouring Shatalin's programme or that of the coordinated "presidential" group. I think there can be no third version: the government programme is aggravating the crisis and not leading to a market economy.

[MOSCOW NEWS] But the programme submitted by the president differs from the one offered by Shatalin-Yavlinskiy. Is Russia ready for concessions?

[Silayev] These differences were debated in our government, and, we think that compromises are possible. Say, the progamme presented by the President, unlike the "Shatalin" programme, presupposes a federal tax. We are prepared to accept this amendment, although with a reservation: the size of the tax must be coordinated with republics. Another difference: the president's programme does not recognize the supremacy of republican laws over USSR laws. But we, too, do not reject a priori any central law. It is important for us that it should not infringe upon the interests of the republic. As for the USSR laws, they are naturally necessary to successfully carry out the reforms. Incidentally, the "500 Days" programme assumes 15 republican and 6 USSR laws.... So, in this matter, too, I think, we can find mutually acceptable formulas. As you can see, we're doing everything possible for the market programme to become all-Union. And the countdown must start from the USSR President's decree.

[MOSCOW NEWS] But, so far, the President has signed a decree which in many respects runs counter to the "Shatalin" programme. The preservation of the established economic ties between all state enterprises for a rather long period of time will inevitably slow down privatization, not to mention the development of commerce, business activity and initiative.

[Silayev] I would not appraise the decree so explicitly. Some measures outlined by it are justified. With their help, I hope it will be possible to avoid anarchy. For example, local bodies today have made it their rule to interfere in relations between producers. Contractual ties are being broken by decisions of the Soviets. For their actions, the local authorities (as distinct from the "contracting parties", which at least pay fines for their refusals) bear no responsibility at all. The decree issued by the President must put an end to this illegal practice.

Of course, it would be more logical if in a crisis situation the republics would voluntarily take under their control economic contacts and not on order from above. Russia has chosen this road: we've already concluded economic agreements with Armenia, Lithuania, Latvia, Georgia and Moldova. Besides, I think the decree embraces a too long space of time, practically the whole period of the reform, which is apparently inexpedient. But the reform hasn't started yet, and I hope it will correct all the decisions passed earlier, including the President's decree.

[MOSCOW NEWS] But don't you think that the number of laws and resolutions to be corrected in the course of the reform is too great? And they are increasing with each passing day. Let's take, for instance, the recent decision of Russia's government to raise the purchase price of meat. Doesn't it contradict the "500 Days" programme?

[Silayev] You're right. Many contradictory decisions are being passsed nowadays. One of them is our decision to raise purchase prices, although we have introduced them only for three months. But it should not be forgotten that we were prompted to take this step by the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers on new purchase prices of meat from January 1, 1991. Having calculated its future profit, farmers in the countryside simply stopped autumn meat sales. But by our decision we are trying to make all meat producers take an interest in trading with the city. Whatever you call it, with our decision we run the risk of undermining the trust of the Union republics, because new economic agreements prevent us from changing prices without any consultation or coordination.

[MOSCOW NEWS] Are there any guarantees that, henceforth, Russia and her partners will refrain from taking such steps?

[Silayev] Yes, because to violate mutual commitments means ruin, and experience proves this. will the Ukraine gain from its ban on the export of goods from the republic if Russia or Belorussia do the same? It is no mere chance that the Estonian government which, in defiance of the preliminary accords, raised the prices in the republic, is trying today to somehow settle the conflicts. The rash actions have questioned the signing of an economic agreement between Estonia and Russia.

[MOSCOW NEWS] You speak about republics, but there is also the USSR government which is loyal to its programme. What if the centre, in addition to purchase prices, raises the wholesale prices as well?

[Silayev] I think that if taken, such a step—running counter to the reform—won't catch us unawares. Today we are trying to build economic relations in the republic and beyond it on the basis of contractual wholesale prices, which corresponds to the principles of the "500 Days" programme, even in the system of republican governments' orders. This is only part of the preparatory steps we are taking, not waiting for the start of the reform.

[MOSCOW NEWS] Did the unplanned delay prove useful?

[Silayev] Yes, in a sense. It gave us an opportunity to work out in a greater detail the plan for carrying out the programme and it will be submitted to the parliament on October 10. And, of course, we hope in the near future to conclude a number of economic agreements with republics. I believe, the USSR Supreme Soviet will consider this weighty argument in favour of the presidential programme.

Silayev Interviewed for Republic Agreements

LD1110095290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1947 GMT on 10 October broadcasts a 9-minute program titled "On the Path to a Union Treaty", including a 6-minute recorded interview with Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR), and Apas Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Kirghiz Council of ministers, by program presenter K. Sultanbekov.

Sultanbekov begins the program by noting a meeting between Silayev and Dzhumagulov in which Silayev says: "We will construct our Union relations based on the signing of analagous agreements with our other republics. This does indeed show concern for strengthening the Union. This is indeed the chance that will allow our Union to acquire a second wind, as they saying goes, and to fill it with new contents. This is not just a matter for our two republics but a matter for the whole Union. Today we are demonstrating the resolve of our govenments to be in the Union. So let us get on with the signing."

Silayev and Dzhumagulov are shown signing an RSFSR-Kirghiz treaty.

At 1950 GMT Sultanbekov is shown interviewing Silayev and Dzhumagulov. Sultanbekov begins by asking: "Are agreements concluded between republics, like the one signed today, in accord with the forthcoming Union treaty?"

Silayev responds: "Clearly they are the foundation of the Union treaty. I would go even further and say these are essential to the Union treaty since it still has many articles and problems which must be examined and which must be resolved with some most complicated agreements and unity. Economic relations, however, allow one to decide vitally important questions more efficiently without waiting for the whole Union treaty to be formulated. The fact that Apas Dzhumagulov and I have signed today for the first economic agreement is a new page in the relations between Russia and Kirghizia."

Dzhumagulov agrees with Silayev on the important of agreement on the Union treaty, saying it has ways to facilitate its implementation and will allow for the chance to exploit unused opportunities. He adds that while Kirghizia receives goods worth 1.7 billion rubles [R] from the RSFSR and supplies goods worth R1.5 billion to the RSFSR, better and balance is sought.

Silayev notes: "I would like to add that the situation whereby the potential of the Russian Federation and Kirghizia is not being fully utilized is the consequence of past centralization. In effect, we communicated with each other a lot; we had many meetings at all sorts of places, but in general we had no cooperation on an economic basis via direct links. We worked for the common basket, for the common center. We were set various quantities and ranges of goods, and we fulfilled them punctually. This, of course, did not at all allow us to elucidate and make use of favorable possibilities for our economic relations. It is a different matter today when we are not operating through the center; our republics and our enterprises engaged in direct relations. Consequently the opportuntiies Apas Dzhumjagulov was mentioned—and I can confirm that we too have unused opportunities—in the republics, this mechanism now makes it possible to use them to the fullest advantage. These are qualitatively new economic relations."

Russian Court Rescinds Moscow Ruling on Kalugin

LD1210130290 Moscow TASS in English 1255 GMT 12 Oct 90

[Reprt by TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—The Russian Supreme Court today rescinded a decision of the Moscow City Court to reject an application by former KGB Major-General Oleg Kalugin to institute proceedings against Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, who stripped Kalugin of his rank.

The court decided that the Moscow City Court should examine Kalugin's application once more, observing all the needed formalities, envisaged by the law. At the same time, the republican court suggested that Kalugin rewrite his application, specifying if he is complaining against actions by Ryzhkov or by the Soviet Government.

RSFSR Law on Relations With Soviets Adopted

PM1110125990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by correspondent Yu. Sorokin: "Khasbulatov Happy, Travkin Sad"]

[Text] The law, which its authors hope is to stop the headlong process of Russia's disintegration into sovereign republics, cities, and villages—the law on relations between soviets and executive bodies during the period of economic reform—was finally adopted yesterday.

Pending the signing of a federative treaty RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] laws operate throughout the republic's territory. Some representatives of autonomous entities—who incidentally found themselves in the minority—had persistently demanded a roll call of all those who dreamed up this "injustice" on which Ruslan Khasbulatov [first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet] noted: An identification parade is hardly necessary since there is no evidence of a crime. And he explained that when working on the economic reform plans the Presidium had concluded that such a law was necessary: Without political stability in the republic reforms are out of the question.

Lower-ranking soviets are now obliged to execute the decisions of higher-ranking ones. Executive committees are acquiring relative independence from "quasi-parliamentary" soviets. Violation of Russian laws or nonexecution of resolutions adopted by the authorities are punishable under administrative law by a fine of between 500 and 10,000 rubles. Incidentally, a somewhat comic row developed around this point: Who should institute proceedings? Can this be done by a prosecutor alone or by any people's deputy on any soviet? After an exhausting discussion common sense nevertheless triumphed and the final word has been left with prosecutors.

Nikolay Travkin [Democratic Party of Russian chairman] proposed that the combining at local level of the posts of soviet and executive chairman be allowed. This would essentially make it possible to switch to a municipal system, but for the time being the proposal was rejected. Travkin stated that as a result the law transforms soviets into an appendage of executive bodies, whereas by contrast Khasbulatov congratulated the Supreme Soviet on the adoption of "a law dealing with oreder in Russia."

It is hardly to be expected, however, that the adoption of a law on Krasnopresenskaya Embankment will mean that order will immediately reign in Russia.

Leningrad Mayor Views Local Government Reform

PM1010152690 London MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19, 5-11 Oct 90 p15

[Article by A. Sobchak, chairman of Leningrad City Soviet: "400 Deputies Are a Luxury We Can't Afford"]

[Text] The second session of the Leningrad City Soviet (Lensoviet) will be a tough and complicated one. It should last at least five or six days, which may not be long enough to debate current issues as well as those already debated at the first session.

Our main task is to review local government structure in the city and surrounding districts. The two parallel bodies—the presidium of the Soviet (council) and the Soviet's Executive Committee—each have their own representatives, but are without authority. However without the presidium's approval, I (for example) cannot appoint office workers to the Lensoviet.

Both bodies function in a similar way, are in reality powerless, yet reign supreme in the Mariinskiy Palace (the seat of local government) and beyond. Each proposed resolution means a battle; even after this there is still no guarantee it will be passed.

The first session created 27 commissions covering such areas as city construction, housing policy and city centre development, the functions of which clearly overlap. So imagine what happens when all three try to decide on one issue.

At the end of the first session, some committee representatives did not even file a report. They tended to concentrate on meetings, thought thse were not fully attended because the chairmen of the commission failed to establish discipline. In principle, all deputies should become paid professional politicians. But 400 deputies in our Soviet (and the 460 in Moscow) would be an inexcusable luxury for taxpayers.

The Russian law on local government structure—the legacy of our administrative command system—is unworkable and needs urgent revision. The number of permanent commissions, will be cut so that each deals with a clearly defined area, and their reports will be presented to the presidium of the soviet.

If we succeed in separating legislative and executive functions, in curbing those who exacerbate the power crisis by incompetence and political intrigue, whether purposesly or not, then we will begin to extract ourselves from the crisis.

If not, then the experiment to make a local soviet operate independently of the party will fail miserably. And if we do not do something about this and the general decline in the economy soon, we may see riots over more than tobacco or alcohol.

Voronezh Citizens Stand in Line for Food Coupons

LD1110145390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1230 GMT on 11 October, in its "Television News Service" program, carries a three-minute report on the food shortage situation in Voronezh. An announcer opens the report by saying:

"The foodstuffs' situation, at any rate in the central areas of Russia, is deteriorating with every passing day. But what is happening in Voronezh, in the center of what was in the past one of the richest oblasts of Russia, has in general gone beyond the limit. There not only have the foodstuffs come to an end, but food coupons too."

Correspondent Nikolay Koltakov then reports that coupons were introduced in Voronezh in October. He speaks to people waiting in line who say it is the third day they have been waiting for coupons. Some say there has been fighting over the coupons, with elderly people being pushed out of the line. A man complains that he cannot buy food in shops without coupons, and that his family of seven has nothing to eat. A woman says that the shops are offering lard instead of meat, and that the only other thing on sale is vermicelli.

Democratic Russia Bloc Holds Regional Conference

LD1110181490 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Rachko]

[Text] Leningrad October 11 TASS—"Radical changes through constructive cooperation" is the motto of the Democratic Russia political bloc which held a regional conference here.

The conference adopted a programme for joint action to consolidate the democratic movement. The forum was attended by representative of the Democratic Platform, Social Democratic, Socialist, and Free Democratic Parties, the Leningrad Popular Front and the Memorial Society.

"We succeeded in finding points of contact and working out a programme based not only on negating the old ways but on fostering new ways as well," Lieutenant-Colonel (retired) Igor Gorbachev, co-chairman of the Committee in Support of the Democratic Russia Movement, told TASS.

"We are still convinced of the need to remove the Soviet Communist Party from power. But it is no less important now to help councils of people's deputies to learn to wield the fullness of power in the country.

"We intend to picket organisations which sabotage councils' decisions, to bring under public control the functioning of law-enforcement agencies and to select personnel for the judges corps and municipal policy."

"During the implementation of the Russian 500-days programme for socio-economic reforms, we shall participate in privatising enterprises, and in inviting specialists to work out a draft new code of laws on labour under a market economy.

"The Democratic Russia bloc associates a solution to the provision of the region with food with the abolition of state farms, the sale of land to farmers and the elimination of the state-placed order for farm produce," Igor Gorbachev said. [sentence as received]

"The bloc's activities are based on the equality of all member parties and non-interference in one another's affairs. Only the propaganda of violence, class, ethnic or religious discord is incompatible with coalition membership," Igor Gorbachev emphasised.

Koryak Autonomous Soviet Republic Proclaimed

LD1110162290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Text] Two months before its 60th anniversary, the Koryak Autonomous Okrug, which was part of Kamchatka Oblast, ceased its existence. At the session of the okrug soviet, the Koryak Autonomous Soviet Republic has been proclaimed within the framework of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

Bashkir ASSR Proclaims State Sovereignty

LD1110202290 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Raul Tukhvatullin]

[Text] Ufa October 11 TASS—A session of the Bashkirian Autonomous Republic's Supreme Soviet here today unanimously approved the declaration of Bashkiria's state sovereignty. The republic will henceforth be called the Bashkirian Soviet Socialist Republic, or Bashkortostan, for short.

The parliament resolved that the document it approved will form the basis for working out the republican constitution, elaborating republican legislation, renewing state structures and preparing and signing the new Union treaty and treaties with Russia and other union republics.

One of the most acute problems—the problem of the state language—was not discussed when proclaiming the republic's sovereignty. The Bashkirs—the indigenous population of the republic—object against making the Tatar language—the language of the second largest population group in Bashkortostan—a state language together with the Bashkiri and Russian languages. The Tatar population, however, favour the sovereignty of their own language.

In order to avoid exacerbating the situation still further, the parliament included the following provision in its declaration of sovereignty: "the Bashkirian Soviet Socialist Republic ensures the conservation, equitable functioning and comprehensive development of the languages and cultural values of all people's inhabiting it."

Komi-Permyak Okrug Becomes Autonomous Oblast

LD1110224690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] An extraordinary session of the Komi-Permyak [Komi-Permyatskiy] Okrug Soviet of People's Deputies today discussed the question of changing the status of the autonomous okrug. An absolute majority voted for transforming the okrug into the Komi-Permyak [Komi-Permyatskaya] Autonomous Oblast. The decision says that on a treaty basis and within the existing borders, the autonomous oblast remains within perm Oblast. A declaration of sovereignty was also adopted.

KOMSOMOLETS Registered as Youth Paper

LD1110145190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 10 October carries a one-minute report on the Karelian newspaper KOMSOMOLETS. An announcer reports that the dispute between the editorial collective of the Karelian youth newspaper KOMSOMOLETS and the Komsomol Oblast party committee has been resolved in favor of the journalists. The question of who founded this publication was examined in the Council of Ministers of the Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, but no decision was made. In these conditions Moscow became the arbiter between the two candidates. The RSFSR Ministry of the Press and Mass Information registered KOMSOMOLETS as an independent youth newspaper, and the editorial labor collective is therefore its founder.

Western Republics

Dacha Plots Allotted for Belorussian Elite

PM1110135490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p2

[Unattributed report: "Belorussia: More Dachas"]

[Text] According to a report in the Minsk-based "7 DAYS" magazine, additional plots of land have been allotted in Zhdanovichi, despite the existing ban against any further construction of dachas in this health resort area.

Sergey Antonchik, member of Belorussia's Supreme Soviet Ad Interim Commission on Privileges, has produced documents revealing that on March 26, 1990, the Minsk Regional Soviet Executive Committee decided to make one exception, and give a plot to the First Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Yefrem Sokolov. Plots were also granted to Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Pechenikov; Business Manager of the Council of Ministers of Belorussia Kavko; Minister of Road Building Mozolyako; Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Trutnev; former Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Belorussia Firisanov, and Minister of Public Education Demchuk.

Belorussian Party's Method of Change Protested

91UN0030A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 16 Sep 90 p 2

[Letter from N. Anisovets, member of the Loyevskiy Rayon Belorussian Communist Party Committee: "Let the Primary Party Organizations Speak"]

[Text] **A significant reduction of the party committee apparatus has been initiated in the republic. The republic newspapers and the radio have reported the dissolution of the rayon party committees [raykoms] in Brest, Grodno, Bobruysk, and a number of other cities. A significant reduction has been announced in the party apparatuses in the rayon and oblast committees and the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.**

What can the majority of rank-and-file Communists expect from this process?

Numerous conversations with comrades here in the rayon have convinced me that an overwhelming majority favor a significant reduction in the inflated party apparatus, which is often unreceptive to the new and constantly changing political and economic situation and is unable to assess a situation quickly and reach a political decision, but is oriented primarily to orders from above. However, what we need is not simple or mechanical reduction but a qualitative transformation.

Communists expect a self-purging of the party apparatuses, ridding them of workers who have compromised and exhausted themselves, the people who during the period of stagnation looked after themselves and mastered the dogma and practice of command-administrative methods, and are reluctant or unable to work in the new way. The party apparatuses should lose primarily those people who do not believe in reason, talent, and the moral strength of their own people and the strength and good sense of the primary party organizations.

Rank-and-file party members are expecting a significant renewal of leading organs, and they hope that the party organizations will get leaders whose word is not at variance with their deeds and who will work within the party and with the people and through the people, and who enjoy the unquestioning trust of the masses and express the aspirations and hopes of all people.

But Communists are increasingly asking questions. Why are the reductions in the party apparatuses in the raykoms and obkoms [oblast party committees] and the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee being initiated without any discussion of their role, their new functions, their staffs, among rank-and-file Communists or in the primary party organizations? Why is there no debate on this issue—an issue that is extremely important for the party—in the republic, oblast, and rayon party press? Perhaps this is a banned subject? But surely the new CPSU Rules are unambiguous about the right of the primary party organizations to debate and work on the most important party decisions. Why then are we violating the CPSU Rules and depriving Communists and primary party organizations of their right to make decisions and to speak out, before adoption of the decision, to say what they want to see in the apparatuses of the higher party organs? Why in an overwhelming majority of cases are the reductions affecting primarily rank-and-file workers in the party apparatuses but not the higher echelon of party functionaries? Why are the reductions in the party apparatus often taking place according to schemes proposed from above, with a plenum or an organ bureau making the final decision, that is essentially leaving real power with a small group of party members rather than with the conference or congress?

These kinds of approaches to the reductions in the apparatus have already occurred in party history, and more than once. We recall the latest reductions in the obkoms and Central Committee apparatuses immediately before the 19th all-Union party conference. It was the same haste, without discussion in the party organizations, to adopt "measures" which were then cheerfully presented as "significant work in restructuring the party apparatus." And did that lead to any fundamental improvement in the work of these organs, or significantly change their function or role? No. Rather the opposite, the situation in the period since then has deteriorated considerably and the apparatus has not demonstrated any ability to restructure its work.

If the previous mechanism is again put into motion today, without the participation of the party masses, then the republic Communist Party risks engaging in a round of games with the apparatus that will not add to its prestige, for only trust from above will be able to engender trust from below. This is axiomatic. Only if there is trust will the process of consolidating and strengthening the party move forward. And so it seems advisable to effect the reductions in the party apparatus on a democratic basis during the present election-and-accountability campaign and to complete the work at the conferences and the congress.

It would be proper already today to provide an opportunity for people to leave the party apparatuses at their own request, and to provide assistance in finding jobs for workers, regardless of their rank, who do not believe in the future of the party or its ability to find the correct solution to today's crisis situation in our society. It would be sensible, during the course of the reports and election campaign to the primary party organizations, to give Communists an opportunity to debate issues pertaining to the new functions and staffs of the apparatuses in the party organs, from the raykom to the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party. It is essential to conduct a debate on this issue in the pages of the party press.

It seems logical to set up commissions at the rayon, oblast, and republic levels that include those Communists who enjoy the greatest prestige and trust among their comrades, and who would embody the opinion of the party organizations and submit a draft decision on the functions and staffs of the party apparatuses for consideration by delegates to the upcoming 31st Belorussian Communist Party Congress.

This must be done if we really are concerned about the future of our party and are ready on this account to reject the immediate interests of an apparatus that is inflated at all levels. Otherwise we may finally undermine the moral foundations of the party and its authority.

From the Editor

The questions raised in this letter are very serious. We believe that they deserve comprehensive consideration both in the press and in the primary party organizations. We await your proposals.

Ukraine-RSFSR Hold 'Consultations'

PM1210082390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent S. Tsikora: "Russia-Ukraine: Interparliamentary Commission"]

[Text] Kiev—A fundamentally new organization, called on to ensure stable ties between Russia and the Ukraine in conditions of sovereignty and market relations, is being set up by deputies of the two republics. They are vesting these important duties in a standing interparliamentary commission.

There has not hitherto been a connecting link between republics of this kind, united as they were by the rigid structure of the former Union. Contacts were effected via the central institutions of power. After the adoption of sovereignty declarations, the political and economic status of the republics changed: The broadening of their rights called for new mechanisms of contact to be created, both with their neighbors and with the center. Legislators of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] went to Kiev to express their views on this issue. The level of the two sides was high enough for consultations to be conducted: The Ukrainian legislators were headed by V. Grinev, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and the Russian legislators by B. Isayev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. A news conference was held at the end of the meeting, enabling a number of the fundamental features to be elucidated.

Having asked that journalists under no circumstances call these contacts negotiations but only consultations, the legislators emphasized in unison that they had not examined questions of immediately supplanting the function of the central organs. The future of the two republics proceeds from their declarations of sovereignty, adopted by the Russian and Ukrainian Supreme Soviets. It is within the framework of the rights recorded in these declarations that both republics intend to base their mutual relations. The legislators stressed that, in their opinion, the main forms of future links would be links between republics, in other words horizontal contacts.

Understanding that the degree of contacts between the two largest republics will to a certain extent influence the structure of relations with their other neighbors also, the RSFSR and the Ukrainian SSR recognized the usefulness of a very early exchange of representatives. It was decided to determine the level of these representatives later. In this connection, attention is drawn to the fact that Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Chairman L. Kravchuk has been invited to visit Moscow for continued consultations.

Students, Deputies Strike Demands Resignations

LD1110173590 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by UKRINFORM-TASS correspondents Viktor Demidenko and Aleksandr Litvinov]

[Text] Kiev October 11 (UKRINFORM-TASS)—People's deputies of the Ukraine met in the republic's Supreme Soviet with representatives of a group of students who made a number of demands on the supreme body of state authority and government of the Ukraine. Since October 2, students have been on a hunger strike. They are staying in tents on Kiev's Square of the October Revolution.

Chairman of the Ukrainian parliament Leonid Kravchuk, deputy chairman of the parliament, chairmen of permanent commissions and heads of a number of ministries and public organisations participated in the meeting.

The students reiterated their demands: the resignation of Ukrainian Premier Vitaliy Masol, the republic's rejection of the union treaty at the given stage, the transfer to local government bodies of property belonging to the

Soviet Communist Party and the Young Communist League in the Ukraine, strictly voluntary military service by Ukrainian youths outside the republic and the reelection of the Ukrainian parliament.

A four-day strike by students in schools, higher educational establishments, vocational training schools and lyceums in Lvov was announced by the student association in Lvov to support the hunger strike of young people in Kiev.

An unsanctioned rally was held on Kiev's Square of the October Revolution late in the evening on October 10. Participants expressed dissatisfaction with the latest decision by the session's Supreme Soviet, specifically with its refusal to demand the resignation of the premier, or to consider depolitising state government bodies and law enforcement bodies. In addition the decree on military service by Ukrainians does not include a provision on voluntary service outside the republic. The rally filled the square and blocked the city's main thoroughfare—Kreshchatik.

Speaking at the rally, representatives of various political organisations, as well as some republican people's deputies urged people to participate in civil disobedience and strikes and demanded the resignation of the president of the Ukrainian parliament, the Ukrainian prime minister, the republic's government and dissolution of the Ukrainian parliament.

It was announced that six people's deputies of the Ukraine, who represent the opposition in the republic's parliament, joined the students' fast.

WWII Veterans' Letter Assails Anticommunist Acts

90UN2897B Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 1

[Letter to the editor from a group of World War II veterans: "Surrendering Without a Fight?"]

[Text] Extremist forces have come to power now in the Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast, or rather forces that are hostile to all the achievements of the October Revolution. They include people who have been in prison for various crimes, people who for some reason feel hurt by the Soviet power, persons who have been previously expelled from the party, and nationalists—members of former Bandera supporters' families.

They managed to win the elections and gain the necessary number of votes. Why? Because the leaders of the Ivano-Frankovsk city party organization proved incapable of coping; they failed to organize Communists and nonparty members; they went underground and let the events follow their own course. Many of the primary organization secretaries were not up to the mark either. As these forces gained power they directed their main blow at the Communists by declaring them hostile elements; these forces breed animosity toward the nonnative part of the population whom they call "Muscovites." We, active participants of the Great Patriotic War, liberators of the Carpathians from the German fascist intruders included, feel insulted at being called invaders.

Acting contrary to our Constitution and Soviet laws, local authorities make illegal decisions that serve to worsen the situation; they make it impossible for an honest person to say a word of truth. It is not for nothing that you can hear so many of the "Death to Communists!" calls at the rallies. It has come to the point where people say: "Give us weapons, we will kill them!"

Many people feel intimidated, Communists among them, and a certain group of Communists are surrendering their membership since they can see no protection for themselves. Local power representatives openly suggest that doctors, teachers, etc.—CPSU members—leave the party, and they even set the time limits for it. All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] and Young Pioneer organizations have been banned in schools. Our grandchildren have been looking forward with joy and great expectation to the day when they would be able to put on Young Pioneer ties, but their hopes cannot come true. How should we understand and explain all of this?

These forces created their own publications—the GALICHINA newspaper in the oblast and the VISNIK KOLOMYI in the city of Kolomyya. These periodicals are full of hostile propaganda aimed at honest people, primarily Communists. One cannot but feel disgusted reading these papers that have nothing but filth and distortion of the actual state of things.

Representatives of local authorities deal with economic problems; the production is falling, the workers' discipline is deteriorating, there is anarchy and chaos everywhere. Illegal actions have been taking place lately; they call V.I. Lenin "an idol" and raze his monuments. For instance, on 17 August 1990 some people in Kolomyya tore the monument to V.I. Lenin off its pedestal and threw it on the property of a road building organization. How should we treat the rally in Ivano-Frankovsk, with its anti-Soviet proclamations, which ended by burning portraits of V.I. Lenin and K. Marx? Are these not fascist actions? By the way, they already have their own groups of "thugs" and use them for their purposes.

The situation in our oblast is very complicated. And it is not clear to us, veterans of the party and of the Great Patriotic War, why no measures are being taken by the leaders of the country and of the republic.

We veterans fought the Great Patriotic War battles at the price of great losses to protect the achievements of the October Revolution. Now these achievements are being surrendered, without a fight, to antisocialist forces as they meet with practically no resistance at all.

We would like to ask: Who profits from this? We have the right to view the absence of any countermeasures as betrayal of the people. How long will it continue?

We followed very attentively the first session of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet and at times we felt ashamed of it. Many of the deputies are hiding behind the name of the people, but they are very wrong. The people have seen who is who.

We deeply condemn them and demand that honest deputies repudiate them in a decisive manner.

We, veterans of the Great Patriotic War, joined the CPSU during the first war years. It was a difficult time for our Fatherland and we did not join the party for selfish gain. We always did and always will believe in the party of Lenin and we will never allow anyone to smear it as it is being smeared by the so-called "democratic" forces.

[Signed] Veterans of the Great Patriotic War and of the USSR Communist Party: A.I. Kosorotov, F.T. Masyuk, G.I. Shvekhterov, P.P. Kiriyenko, I.A. Onishchenko, and others.

Kharkov Obkom Political Clashes With RuKh Viewed

90UN2897A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 26 Sep 90 p 1

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent N. Belov: "Fat in Somebody Else's Fire: The Outcome of Communists' Participation in 'Informals' Rally"]

[Text] **A light and dark blue flag was put up in the center of Kharkov, next to a plaque commemorating the Ukrainian sovereignty declaration. The flag was burned by someone, but the someone was never found. The incident provided Ukraine People's Movement for Perestroyka [RuKh] leaders with a reason to blame it on party officials and other "heirs to the imperial ideology." Communists paid back in kind and suggested that it was the Rukh members themselves who had arranged the flag burning because they wanted to inflame an already heated situation.**

The emotions continue to seethe and often they grow into a squabble with insults from both sides. It is becoming a tradition to conduct rallies in the center of the city.

The cause for this rally would have been rather significant a month ago: a show of support for the declaration on the sovereignty of the Ukraine. One could expect unanimous support for the declaration since it was adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the republic practically unopposed. But what happened? Frenzied and turbulent appeals to overthrow the CPSU and its leaders were flying above the square.

Our party leaders did not take part in the rally. Instead, at an oblast party committee [obkom] bureau session a week later, they assessed it from a political point of view; they criticized the deputies and Communists who had allowed the rally to be held in the most crowded area of the city.

This kind of office prophylactics did not and would not help. Recently Rukh and its supporters submitted a request for another rally. The city party committee [gorkom] officials decided to change their policy and to participate in the rally also.

The Rukh people talk constantly about consolidation, but they did not like such a turn of events. In a categorical manner they rejected the Communists' offer.

Again, about a month ago, they continued denouncing the CPSU from the podium, its past and present; they praised the "great son of the Ukrainian people" Bandera; they complemented all this with a demand for an immediate resignation of the Union government. They threatened to arrange an all-Ukrainian strike if their conditions were not met.

"They orate in the name of the people," said a middle-aged worker from the plant Imeni Malyshev who was standing next to me. "And where are the people? I do not see any workers and there are hundreds of thousands of them in Kharkov. The obkom folks are no better either: There they are crowding at the edge of the square. They had better call workers from enterprises and conduct their own rally at that very corner of the square where they are standing now. Use loudspeakers, too. People would have trusted them more, anyway..."

At that time another speaker declared, without a trace of embarrassment, that the party was trying to drive young people into video salons with their porno films to distract them from politics. But suppose you try to take the microphone and ask him: Why do "informals" sell pornographic literature in the square beside their newspapers? You will not get an answer. Nobody will even hear you.

"This is now more than an argument, or a discussion, or an attempt to resolve our economic and political problems," the gorkom secretary, O. Demin, told me after the rally. "It is straightforward extremism and it has nothing in common with democracy."

Many people in Kharkov feel concerned with the events and they think that the oblast Soviet and executive committee should allow rallies and meetings in covered premises only.

The Kharkov Obkom is changing its policy now. They are preparing meetings and rallies with workers at enterprises—in places where it is the workers who set the tone, in places where the Communists are sure to find response and support.

Caucasus

KGB Raids Plane Carrying Arms to Caucasus

LD0610055990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 5 October in its "Vremya" newscast carries a two-minute report on a KGB raid on an airliner suspected of smuggling arms to the transcaucasus.

The announcer begins: "Television viewers already know from the papers that it was necessary for a KGB special purpose group with machineguns at the ready to break into the cabin of a Tu-134 departmental airliner. The prompting for the sudden operation was a call to the KGB administration on a possible arms shipment to the Transcaucasus."

Vremya correspondent Morozova then recounts how the special purpose troops burst into the cabin of the plane, belonging to the Omsk Baranov motor building association. She continues: "Twenty-seven passengers on the impending flight, not having passed the special checkpoint in the airport, were enjoying the delights of life behind small tables served with various delicacies." The company, including two first secretaries of rayon committees, two commanders of air detachments, and two organizers of international youth tourism, were on a three-day trip to the south without tickets or documentation for the trip. A figure calling himself Kosabyan is singled out by Morozova for special attention. He claims to be a supplier for a northern collective farm, chairman of an Omsk cooperative, and representative of an unidentified joint Soviet-UK firm based in Yakutia which was subsidizing the flight of the departmental airplane to Rostov, supposedly for repair work. The procuracy will examine the veracity of this, the report concludes.

New Minister, Officials Appointed in Armenia

NC1210080390 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] On the basis of an Armenian Supreme Soviet decision, Robert Mehrabyan has been appointed as the Republic's Food Industry Minister. Levon Davchyan was appointed as chairman of the State Statistics Committee, and Grigor Arutyunyan was appointed as chairman of the State Committee for the Implementation of Special Economic Projects.

The 45-year old Robert Mehrabyan graduated from Yerevan's Polytechnic Institute and worked in the Armenian Food Industry Ministry and carried out party activities in the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. He was also first secretary of the Megriskiy party committee.

The (?54)-year old Levon Davchyan is a graduate of the Yerevan State University. He has worked in (?scientific establishments). The position of chairman of the State Statistics Committee (?has been empty) since 1988.

The 38-year Grigor Arutyunyan is a (?construction expert). Since (?last year) he has been heading the Yerevan [word indistinct] construction union which is carrying out construction activities in Artsakh.

Stepanakert Organizations Reportedly on Strike

NC1210081390 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] It has become known that on 10 October between 1500 and 1700 local time, all the organizations and establishments in Stepanakert stopped working and an initial strike was declared to protest the illegal detention of Armenian legislator Roles Aghadzhanyan. Some 40 labor collectives have sent cables to the relative bodies in Moscow and Yerevan demanding the immediate release of the detained people's deputy.

Armenian Collegium Meets Over Armed Attack

NC1010131390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0400 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Text] A [word indistinct] meeting of the collegium of the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry took place in Talin and discussed the situation in the Talinskiy Rayon branch of the Internal Affairs Ministry. Taking advantage of the disorganization, lack of discipline, and unprincipled attitude in the ranks of its leadership and staff, an unidentified armed gang launched a bandit attack on an Internal Affairs Ministry store and seized arms and ammunition. Hearing (?about the arrival of the minister of internal affairs), hundreds of residents of Talin and nearby villages gathered in the square in Talin. An impromptu press conference was held first in the square and then in the conference hall. Minister Kazaryan briefed the people about the situation in the republic [words indistinct] and the measures being taken by the ministry. He pointed that a stable legal order is the basis for any national statehood [words indistinct] and the law enforcement bodies must act (?conscientiously) to bolster it.

Next, the collegium of the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry held a meeting. Representatives of the public and heads of the internal affairs departments of the adjacent rayons were also invited to the meeting. The members of collegium spoke severely and analytically about the conditions that contributed to the criminal act from taking place. The militia workers must finally abandon their unprincipled and [words indistinct] attitude which under difficult conditions is treason, noted Kazaryan. We need workers who are informed, principled, and specialized and who hold high human values and face the people with clear consciences. We will defend our statehood and ensure our national revival with the assistance of such workers.

The collegium took appropriate (?disciplinary action) against the head of the Talinskiy Rayon branch of the Internal Affairs Ministry and against a number of workers in connection with the grave incident. [Name indistinct] was appointed the (?head) of the rayon branch of the Internal Affairs Ministry.

Armenian Anticrime Body Becomes Operational

LD0710100190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 7 Oct 90

[Text] A report in from Yerevan: After being sworn in, the first detachment formed under the Armenian Ministry of Internal Affairs to fight organized crime has begun service. Informing the republic's population that the division, formed by decision of the republic's parliament, is beginning to carry out its service duties, Sarkisyan, the chairman of the permanent commission on defense and internal affairs, stressed in particular that all those armed formations which do not submit from now on to the government are declared illegal with all the ensuing consequences.

Armenia, Azerbaijan Ministries Exchange Notes

PM1110132590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 90 p 1

[Article by V. Aloyan under the "Political Chronicle" rubric: "Season of Notes: Will a New Stage in Relations between Azerbaijan and Armenia Start?"]

[Text] Border conflicts on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan have ended for the time being. Let us hope they have ended forever. Now the two republics' foreign ministries, as befits the ministries of two neighboring states, are exchanging protest notes. A TASS account of the first note from the Azerbaijan on the actions of the Armenian side, "the aim of which is the territorial dismemberment of Azerbaijan," was read out on the Vremya program on 18 September. The next day the Armenian Foreign Ministry reported in the local press that it is usual world practice to send notes directly to each other rather than through the mass media of a third party and that they had not received the actual note. Three weeks later the aforementioned note reached its addressee. The Armenian Foreign Ministry note in response was published in Saturday's newspapers. It said in particular that the "Armenian Government" considers the basis of the conflict in the region to be not the territorial claims on Azerbaijan, but just one question—the recognition of the constitutional right of self-determination of the Armenian population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autononomous Oblast.

Yes, it is better to exchange notes than hail-dispersing shells.

Azerbaijan Communists Lead in Unofficial Poll

LD0610233990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 6 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Oct (TASS)—Evidently in the new legislature of Azerbaijan the Communist Party will retain its leading position. Although the official results of the elections that ended in this Soviet Transcaucasian republic last Sunday have not yet been published, according to the first unofficial data Communists have won in the majority of constituencies.

According to data in the local press, 75 of the 81 first secretaries of the party city committees and rayon committees have already secured for themselves a deputy's mandate. Geydar Aliyev, retired former member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers who received 95 percent of the votes in his home in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, is returning once again to the political arena.

Representatives of the democratic bloc of Azerbaijan will appear in the republic's legislature in which there will be 350 deputies for the first time. According to preliminary data, 20 of them have been elected.

There is also information that only 52 percent of the electorate in Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan, made use of their right to vote, which does not testify to too great activity on their part. There is to be a second round in a number of constituencies.

What do these first, albeit unofficial results of the legislative elections say? In the first place, unlike some other Union republics where alternative forces to the Communists achieved more considerable successes in the elections, the Communist Party of Azerbaijan managed to maintain a firm majority in parliament; this will allow it, without visible obstacles on the part of the opposition, to implement its program aimed at solving a great number of the socioeconomic problems facing the republic.

First of all, the new composition of the legislature must normalize as quickly as possible relations with neighboring Armenia on the basis of political dialogue and constructive talks. Second, the results of the elections have shown that the opposition was not ready for them. It is a matter here not only of the inability to organize a pre-election campaign well, which is itself important, but also of the absence of a serious alternative to the pre-election campaign of the Communist Party capable of winning the trust of the electorate. The struggle within various social movements, which did not further the consolidation and strengthening of their influence among the masses, should not be discounted either.

Not long before the elections, Elmira Kafarov, chairperson of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, in an interview to journalists expressed confidence that the new legislature of the republic—which was the first in the USSR to adopt a law on sovereignty—would further the political and economic independence of Azerbaijan. One wishes to believe that. However, to implement its thoughts it is necessary for the new republican leadership to restructure its work completely, to stabilize the social situation, and to begin to implement the program of the transition to market relations. Otherwise any declarations and expressions of intent may remain only on paper as has already been the case.

240 Results Announced

LD1110173890 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Report by AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku October 11—Two hundred and forty people's deputies have already been elected to Azerbaijan's parliament, filling two-thirds of the seats in parliament. The Central Election Commission published the lists of elected deputies in the local press, although the commission has yet to issue complete returns.

One hundred and twenty seats remain vacant. In 54 constituencies, candidates who failed to earn the necessary number of votes will run again on October 14. In 55 constituencies, the election campaign will start again from scratch. In eleven constituencies—in Nagorno-Karabakh and Shaumyan district of Azerbaijan—elections will be held later.

More than 130 seats on Azerbaijan's Supreme Soviet went to party functionaries, government officials and managers with prominent posts. Among those who were elected to parliament after the first round are representatives of the Azerbaijani Communist Party, Popular Front, Committee of People's Aid to Karabakh and other public organisations and movements. Slightly over 30 mandates went to teachers, medics, journalists and workers in the arts. Officials of law enforcement bodies, who previously were not represented in parliament, earned 21 seats. Workers and peasants won the fewest number of seats in the republic's history, dropping to nine as against 180 in the previous composition.

An unemployed was elected to the Azerbaijani parliament for the first time. Moscow resident Geydar Aliyev, former member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and former Azerbaijani Communist Party Chief, was elected to parliament in an uncontested election. Two other Azerbaijani Moscow residents—Kerim Kerimov, chairman of the State Commission for Test Flights of Manned Spacecraft, and Tair Salakhov, first secretary of the Board of the USSR Artists' Union—were not elected to the republic's supreme soviet.

Radioactivity Level in Sheki Rayon Studied

NC1110100190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 8 Oct 90

[Text] Research conducted by a group of USSR Ministry of Geology experts and their colleagues in Azerbaijan to study the situation of radioactivity in Sheki Rayon has yielded hope-inspiring results. The research was the result of an initiative made by the Sheki City Soviet. Acording to the results of nearly six months' research work, the experts have concluded that the level of radioactivity in Sheki has been low for many years. This is now an established fact. The city's people, including those in the large industrial establishments and vacation centers, are told of the radioactivity situation by the local radio every day. The residents of Sheki [words indistinct]. Meanwhile, the (?examination) of food, particularly flour and sugar imported from the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Belorussian SSR, has removed their uneasiness.

The ecological research which is being carried out in stages will be continued to determine the extent of air and water pollution and the extent of contamination in plants. Meanwhile, plans have also been made to determine the extent to which people are affected by the noise of the production process in Sheki's industrial establishments.

Calls for Georgian Government To Quit 'Widespread'

LD1110033290 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Excerpts] There have been congressional elections held in Georgia, Transcaucasia, at the initiative of that republic's most radical opposition parties.

Local observers believe that the national congress may become an alternative body of power as our correspondent reports: [passage omitted]

Running the elections are six political alliances uniting 27 parties plus eight parties with election platforms of their own.

The election campaign exposed the intolerance of the representatives of the political blocs towards each other. Mutual insults at rallies and in the media turned into armed clashes from time to time.

The social and political unrest is being blamed on the government. Many people in Georgia believe that the cabinet has discredited itself for its inaction. There is a widespread belief that the republican government should urgently resign and an interim coalition cabinet should be formed timely with all the political forces taking part.

So what is the national congress' program of actions? The press secretary of Georgia's National Democratic Party, Miss Irina Sarishvili-Chanturia, urges that the Supreme Soviet is to stipulate its real status upon its election. After that, the question will be officially raised on the status of Soviet troops in Georgia and on Georgia's status as a whole. The congress will demand this from the parliament. Simultaneously, Miss Sarishvili-Chanturia said we are beginning to recruit a national army of our own. The national congress has its own program. In keeping with the mechanism we devised, she added, national disobedience will be carried out.

If we leave the press secretary's rhetoric aside, what she said can't help (?to ring) alarm. This is an openly separatist position aimed at severing Georgia's deeply rooted ties with this country's other regions. No wonder many voters ignored the elections, which incidentaly were accompanied by voting irregularities at many polling stations. For all these reasons the elections were incomplete, so there will be run-off voting at some constituencies in two week's time.

Central Asia

Current Political Situation in Kirghizia Viewed

PM0910152190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by correspondent K. Bayalinov: "Emergency Situation Continues"]

[Text] Frunze—After nearly five years' silence Turdakun Usubaliyev, the disgraced politician who headed Kirghizia for nearly 25 years under Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Andropov, Chernenko, and even for a little while under Gorbachev, has announced his presence. SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA has begun to print chapters from his memoirs. A retiree of Union significance and a scientific staffer at the capital's library, carefully taking advantage of the moment, he has made a step worthy of a major politician. Will he take a second step by joining in the game in earnest? Who knows...? But it is already obvious that T. Usubaliyev, despite his advanced age of 71 and his obviously obsolete and unpopular ideological orientation, will be able to exert substantial influence on the disposition of forces.

The Osh events, especially their muted assessment by the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, have aroused the political activeness of people's deputies who only quite recently voted obediently for resolutions prepared in the apparatus. For the first time in the republic's entire history an official parliamentary opposition has been created—the deputies' group "for democratic and civil consensus." Its composition is very motley. From the formerly persecuted to those who used to persecute them; from yesterday's pillars of stagnation to party apparatchiks who have begun to see the light and hurriedly "moved to the left."

Your correspondent asked the writer and Kirghiz People's Deputy Kazat Akmatov to comment on the sociopolitical situation which has taken shape in the republic.

"At the session whose session the leadership has been putting off for several months now in the hope of lowering the pitch of political passions, the legislative opposition—over one third of the deputies—will submit questions about the introduction of presidential power—in the long term through open, direct, nationwide election—and draft laws on the separation of the functions of state and party power and the republic's sovereignty."

But here is a paradox: The republic is experiencing an eruption of political activeness, but to this day in a good half of the republic there operates... a state of emergency and a curfew. Special orders of the commandants have banned the activity of all sociopolitical formations and political parties, except of course the Communist Party. Any rallies or meetings by these parties are broken up with batons.

The 26 sociopolitical organizations, from the tiny to the mass-based, which belong to the "Kirgyzstan" democratic movement, a kind of People's Front, have not yet been registered on the grounds that there is now a curfew.... Even societies like "Ekolog" and "Memorial," which have existed for a long time and enjoy authority in the Union, are not registered or recognized by the authorities.

It is no secret that each leader in the republic is selecting a team for himself consisting mainly of fellow countrymen and distant or close relations. It is among them and in his own region that he draws support and buttressing. But today after the well known events, the Central Committee leadership, having lost its former support among the people and nomenklatura of Osh Oblast, is appealing to the old traditions involving relations and fellow countrymen—acts are being prepared on the creation of three oblasts of the old type: Frunze, Talas, and Naryn Oblasts. The political and economic uncertainty which the transition to market relations entails is not being taken into account. The republic has been nurturing the wrong superstructure. Political pragmatists are trying to set the nomenklatura of the oblasts they are proposing, those same Central Committee members and people's deputies, against each other, and can you imagine the kind of struggle for portfolios which will flare up? That will also divert from the consolidation of progressively minded people for the sake of a democratic change to existing power.

Agreement Signed Between Tajikistan, Turkmenistan

LD1110163690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] An agreement on economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation between Turkmenistan and Tadzhik Soviet Socialist Republic was signed in Ashkhabad today. The document envisages realization of direct, economic, and other ties in the conditions of mutually benificial partnership, and in the future creation of joint ventures and other activities. It is planned to open up permanent missions in Ashkhabad and Dushanbe.

Turkmenia Opts for Presidential Form of Rule

LD1110172190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Oct 90

[Text] A presidential form of rule will be instituted in Turkmenia. Deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet started to consider a draft law on this today. It is intended that the president will exercise supreme executive power, head the Council of Ministers, and represent the republic within the Union and internationally. He is to be elected through a universal, equal, and direct secret ballot for five years, but not for more than two terms.

The elections have been scheduled for 27 October.

Niyazov, the leader of the republican Communist Party, has been nominated for the post, so far without any other contestant.

Unemployment Problem in Uzbekistan Examined

PM0910171590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Viktor Artemenko: "Why There Are a Million Without Work"]

[Text] Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—I made his acquaintance in a region of the old city of Tashkent which illegally houses an employment exchange. Sh. Nabiyev was looking for work here. In the Fergana valley, his homeland, it is crowded; there was no work for him so he decided to try his luck in the capital. For a month now, Shukhrat complains, he has been unable to find work.

Not surprisingly: Today in Tashkent alone there is a manpower surplus of about 200,000. A door-to-door survey was carried out in the republic recently. It turned out about 1 million people are seeking work. Overall, one-fifth of the population of Uzbekistan—and that is 4 million people!—have no permanent work.

But here is another aspect of the problem—in Tashkent and in any other city in the republic advertisements stare you in the eye from every pillar so to speak, asking for manpower. Today there are over 10,000 vacant jobs in the city's industrial enterprises.

This problem has been particularly aggravated recently—there is a mass drain of the nonindigenous population. Class specialists and qualified manpower are leaving. There is no one to fill the vacant jobs. At the republic's industrial enterprises only 25 to 30 percent of cadres are of indigenous nationality. If people in the republic really want to extricate themselves from the fetters of poverty and backwardness, they must engage in very great earnest in the training of young people and help them to master modern professions. There can be no stinting in this matter.

Enterprises also have a whole host of concerns. Kh. Gulyamov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, described instructive observations:

"At the 'Tashselmash' association I recently gathered together 50 boys of indigenous nationality. I asked them: What should be done for Uzbeks to go into production work and stay there? What did I not hear! On the basis of this and other similar meetings we elaborated measures in which, and it is no joke, we included 28 specific problems. They must be resolved as rapidly as possible."

There is no denying that the ethnic problem is foremost among them. As a rule young people from the hamlets come to the city to work. In their majority they do not know the Russian language. And at the enterprises there are very few mentors of indigenous nationality, and there is no technical literature, and there are no handbooks in their native language. There is also long, hard work to improve working and daily living conditions for cadres of local nationality.

Much has already been done in this direction. The purposeful creation of specific jobs is under way on the basis of the results of a stocktaking of personnel. Proceeding from the republic's conditions, preference will be given to medium and small enterprises. For instance, the cooperative members of Samarkand Oblast are creating jobs for the inhabitants of remote regions—in the hamlets hundreds of workshops are already in operation producing construction materials and ceramic dishes and sewing clothing. Next in line is the recruitment of young people, particularly in rural areas, to science-intensive production. In this matter special responsibility rests with the collectives of the enterprises of the defense complex and the group "A" sectors.

In brief, time brooks no delay. We must resolve the problem of the rational and effective employment of Uzbekistan's able-bodied population. This is a very complex question of enormous political significance. The problem will be aggravated with the transition to the market. The fate of the young people graduating from schools and higher educational establishments and demobilized from the Army, and of women who are mothers, depends on whether it is successfully resolved, as does the fate of thousands of the unemployed like Shukhrat Nabiyev.